DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 648 IR 057 829

AUTHOR	Croneis, Karen S., Comp.; Short, Bradley H., Comp.
TITLE	Branch Libraries and Discrete Collections. SPEC Kit 255.
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, DC. Office of Leadership and Management Services.
ISSN	ISSN-0160-3582
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	114p.; SPEC Flyer not included with this SPEC Kit. Published six times a year.
AVAILABLE FROM	ARL Publications Distribution Center, P.O. Box 531, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-0531 ($40 non-members; $30 members, plus $6 each shipping and handling). Tel: 301-362-8196; Fax: 301-206-9789; e-mail: pubs@arl.org; Web site: http://www.arl.org/pubscat/index.html.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
JOURNAL CIT	SPEC Kit; n255 2000
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; *Branch Libraries; Higher Education; Library Networks; Library Planning; Library Policy; Library Surveys; *Research Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	Association of Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

This SPEC (Systems and Procedures Exchange Center) Kit reports results of a survey attempting to characterize "branch libraries" and "discrete collections" housed in main academic libraries. The results provide a snapshot of current definitions, subject areas, services, and administration of these collections, as well as document the reasons and influences for changes, both past and anticipated. The survey was distributed to the 122 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members in the summer of 1999, and 54 responses (44%) were received. Fifty-one institutions reported having over 400 branch libraries and other discrete collection locations, excluding law, medical, government documents, and special collections. Results are provided on: definition of terms, subject areas, services, administration, past changes, decision-making factors, details of new locations, details of closed locations, details of mergers, anticipated changes, impact of electronic resources, and evaluation process. Documents representing library policies and procedures, and planning and evaluation from selected responding libraries are presented after the survey form. Contains 13 selected resources. (AEF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 648

SPEC

Kit 255

Branch Libraries and Discrete Collections

December 1999

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Verna

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ● This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR057829

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Branch Libraries and Discrete Collections

A SPEC Kit compiled by

Karen S. Croneis
Associate Dean for Collections and Information Services
University of Alabama

Bradley H. Short
Music Librarian, Gaylord Music Library
Washington University–St. Louis

December 1999

Series Editor: Lee Anne George
Production Coordinator: Peter Budka

SPEC Kits are published by the

Association of Research Libraries
OFFICE OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES
21 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-1118
(202) 296-2296 Fax (202) 872-0884
<http://www.arl.org/olms/infosvcs.html>
<pubs@arl.org>

ISSN 0160 3582

Copyright © 2000
The papers in this compilation are copyrighted by the Association of Research Libraries. ARL grants blanket permission to reproduce and distribute copies of these works for nonprofit, educational, or library purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost, and that ARL, the source, and copyright notice are included on each copy. This permission is in addition to rights of reproduction granted under Sections 107, 108, and other provisions of the U.S. Copyright Act.

∞ *The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).*

SPEC

Supporting Effective Library Management for Over Twenty Years

Committed to assisting research and academic libraries in the continuous improvement of management systems, OLMS has worked since 1970 to gather and disseminate the best practices for library needs. As part of its committtment, OLMS maintains an active publications program best known for its SPEC Kits. Through the OLMS Collaborative Research/Writing Program, librarians work with ARL staff to design SPEC surveys and write publications. Originally established as an information source for ARL member libraries, the SPEC series has grown to serve the needs of the library community worldwide.

What Are SPEC Kits?

Published six times per year, SPEC Kits contain the most valuable, up-to-date information on the latest issues of concern to libraries and librarians today. They are the result of a systematic survey of ARL member libraries on a particular topic related to current practice in the field. Each SPEC Kit contains an executive summary of the survey results (previously printed as the SPEC Flyer); survey questions with tallies and selected comments; the best representative documents from survey participants, such as policies, procedures, handbooks, guidelines, websites, records, brochures, and statements; and a selected reading list—both in print and online sources—containing the most current literature available on the topic for further study.

Subscribe to SPEC

Subscribers tell us that the information contained in SPEC Kits is valuable to a variety of users, both inside and outside the library. SPEC purchasers use the documentation found in SPEC Kits as a point of departure for research and problem solving because they lend immediate authority to proposals and set standards for designing programs or writing procedure statements. SPEC Kits also function as an important reference tool for library administrators, staff, students, and professionals in allied disciplines who may not have access to this kind of information.

SPEC Kits can be ordered directly from the ARL Publications Distribution Center. To order, call (301) 362-8196, fax (301) 206-9789, email <pubs@arl.org>, or go to <http://www.arl.org/pubscat/index.html>.

Information on SPEC and other OLMS products and services can be found on the ARL website at <http://www.arl.org/olms/infosvcs.html>. The website for SPEC is <http://www.arl.org/spec/index.html>. The executive summary or flyer for each kit after December 1993 can be accessed free of charge at the SPEC website.

4

SPEC

Kit 255 Branch Libraries and Discrete Collections

December 1999

Survey

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 7

SURVEY RESULTS 13

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS 22

Representative Documents

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Iowa State University

Branch Facilities Support & Development Policy 26

University of Kentucky

Policies and Procedures for Establishing Branch Libraries and Educational Unit Library Collections 30

Ohio University

Departmental Libraries: Guidelines & Requirements 38

Texas Tech University

Operating Policy and Procedure Manual: Branch Libraries 42

PLANNING AND EVALUATION

University of Washington

Task Force on Service Location Evaluation: Final Report 46

Strategic and Facilities Master Plan 84

User Surveys 105

Survey 98 106

Additional Survey for Fine Arts Faculty 107

Spring 1998 Fine Arts Survey Results 109

Selected Resources

BOOKS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES 113

SPEC

SURVEY

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

SPEC Kit 255
Branch Libraries and Discrete Collections

Executive Summary

Introduction

Branch libraries exist in academia for many reasons. Prompted by changing circumstances and evolving technological capabilities, libraries periodically wrestle with the question of centralizing or decentralizing services and collections. After weighing a complex set of trade-offs concerning user needs and organizational realities, institutions decide to add, close, or merge collection locations.

The 1983 SPEC Kit on branch libraries (*Branch Libraries*, SPEC Kit 99, Nov.–Dec. 1983) illustrated—and this survey confirms—that there is no single best course of action. Both reports reflect the technological capabilities of the day. In 1983, libraries used automated circulation systems to combine branch library operations and provide intellectual integration of in-house library collections. The current generation of technological tools gives libraries the ability to integrate resources from both inside and outside the library. Internet gateways and websites significantly influence the ways patrons perceive and use libraries. User attitudes and behaviors are changing in ways libraries do not yet fully understand. Nonetheless, libraries are compelled to look once again at issues of centralization and decentralization.

This survey attempted to characterize not only "branch libraries," but also "discrete collections" housed in main libraries. The two terms are used interchangeably throughout this report. The results provide a snapshot of current definitions, subject areas, services, and administration of these collections. They also document the reasons and influences for changes, both past and anticipated.

The survey was distributed to the 122 ARL member libraries in the summer of 1999. A total of 54 responses (44%) were received. Fifty-one institutions reported having over 400 branch libraries and other discrete collection locations, excluding law, medical, government documents, and special collections.

Definition of Terms

Institutions use a variety of terms to refer to collections in separate locations. All but 16 of the 51 responding libraries use a combination of terms. "Branch library" is used by 76% of the respondents, "unit" by 24%, "reading room" by 20%, "departmental library" by 18%, and "subject library" by 16%. If the actual number of collections is used as the measuring stick, there are by far more branch libraries (47%) than any other designation. Departmental library (11%) is a distant second, followed by unit (9%), reading room (7%), and a handful of other terms.

From the comments gathered in the survey, a definition of what constitutes a branch library begins to emerge. The definitions given by respondents most often emphasize the concept of separateness: separate location or building, separately housed collection, or separate unit or services. A typical branch is outside and often geographically distant from the main campus library, but still within proximity to the department, school, or college that it serves. Branch libraries most often house subject-based or subject-specific collections. In some cases, branch libraries refer to sister libraries on branch campuses of the same governing institution. Lastly, branch libraries often offer the same level of public service as the main library of the parent institution and have a direct administrative relationship with the main library.

Subject Areas

There were no surprises regarding the breakdown of subject areas covered by the discrete collection locations. Of the responding institutions, 82% reported having locations that serve science and technology, 75% arts and humanities, and 61% social sciences. A tally of the actual number of discrete collection locations yields the same order: science and technology (41%), arts and humanities (17%), and social sciences (16%). A hypothetically "average" institution has 15 discrete collection locations: four science and technology, two arts and humanities, two social sciences, two combined collections, two area studies, one undergraduate, and two other collections, of which media resources and maps are the most frequently mentioned.

Services

Reference, bibliographic instruction, and circulation services are offered in the discrete collection locations of all responding institutions. Other services routinely offered in addition to this minimal level include reserves (98%), web pages (94%), and copy services (82%). Almost two-thirds of the respondents provide interlibrary loan (65%), while significantly fewer offer acquisitions (41%) and cataloging or technical services (35%).

Administration

Reporting Relationships. Not surprisingly, the vast majority (90%) of discrete collection locations report to one level or another of the main campus library administration. Among the remaining 10%, branch and departmental libraries are most likely to report to another unit.

Staff. Approximately 2,250 FTE employees work in discrete collection locations in the reporting libraries. Of these, 26% are professional librarians, 43% support staff, 22% student assistants, 5% clerical staff, and 4% other professionals. Professional librarians work in discrete collection locations in 88% of the responding universities.

These 2,250 FTE represent 27% of all library staff in the reporting institutions. The distribution of staff in discrete locations mirrors very closely the distribution of employees among the total staff. Professional librarians account for 25%, support staff 43%, student assistants 25%, other professionals 5%, and clerical staff 3%.

Past Changes

Forty-three percent of those responding (22 libraries) reported a total of 45 changes in discrete collection locations during the past five years. Specifically, there were 11 additions, 19 closings, and 15 mergers. These institutions reported 18 changes in science and technology locations, 10 in social sciences, 6 in arts and humanities, 5 in combined collections, 3 in area studies, and 3 in undergraduate collections.

The changes reported for undergraduate collections were all closures. There were a few additions in each of the other subject areas. Social sciences collections were most likely to be merged, accounting for 40% of all mergers. Most surprising was the fact that 58% of all closings were in science and technology subject areas.

Changes reported in 1999 for the previous five years revealed that additions accounted for 24% of the changes, closings for 42%, and mergers for 33%. Changes reported in 1983 for a comparable five-year period present a different picture: additions accounted for 32% of the changes, closings for 27%, and mergers for 41%. The difference between the 1999 and 1983 numbers illustrates dramatic trends, especially in additions and closures. New additions are not as common today as they were in 1983, while branch closures have become more common.

A comparison of subject areas involved in changes shows less variation. In 1983, changes occurred in science and technology areas 41% of the time, arts and humanities 21% of the time, social sciences 20%, and combined collections 10% ("Area studies" and "undergraduate" categories were not used in the 1983 survey). Using the same four categories, the percentages for change reported in 1999 for subject areas are science and technology

46%, social sciences 26%, arts and humanities 15%, and combined collections 13%.

Decision-making Factors

Many factors contribute to the decision-making process. Participant responses separated the most important factors fairly clearly, although the reasons to add new locations varied more than those to close or merge branches. As expected, the need for additional space is a significant issue for most libraries.

When adding a location, an academic or program change, service or access considerations, and political or administrative considerations of the university were most frequently cited, in this order, as the motivating factor. These priorities would seem to indicate that, in most cases, the library is responding either to academic changes on the local campus or a change in programmatic direction by the institution. Presumably, additional locations for library services are a physical manifestation of an academic or programmatic decision, and thus the library is a partner in the academic or programmatic process.

A weighted average of all responses, however, reveals that the cost or funding of the project is the most influential factor in deciding about adding locations, followed by political or administrative considerations of the university and service or access considerations. An academic or program change tied for fourth place in the weighted rankings with technological or computer considerations. The differential between ranking by the raw number of respondents and the weighted ranking underscores the wide variety of factors influencing the addition of collection locations.

In contrast to the many reasons for opening an additional location, the most cited and most influential factor for closing branches was cost. Cost or funding was mentioned 14 times as a motivation for closings. The next most frequently mentioned factor—political or administrative considerations of the university—garnered only six votes, followed by an academic or program change with five. The weighted averages of reasons for closing collections yielded a similar, though not identical, order. Costs or funding averaged 1.58; political or administrative considerations of the university averaged 1.60; and political or administrative considerations of the department or school averaged 1.88 (the smaller the weighted result, the more influential the factor). The similarity between number of responses and weighted averages suggests that neither academic nor programmatic decisions are the driving factors for closing branch library services. It is, perhaps, disheartening that decisions to reduce library services are not based mainly on the same sort of academic or programmatic process that governs the addition of library services.

The influence of decision-making factors on mergers was the same for both raw number rankings and weighted averages for all seven categories. Cost or funding was most influential, followed by service or access considerations, political or administrative considerations of the library, and academic or program change. Clearly, the library has the most influence and control in the area of merging collections. "Considerations of the library" rated sixth out of seven factors when it came to closing branches (with technological or computer considerations being last) and seventh out of seven in respect to adding locations. Mindful of the costs of decentralization, libraries appear reluctant still to add locations unless there are academic or programmatic reasons to do so.

Details of New Locations

On all but three campuses, new locations were funded in a combination of ways. Of 14 respondents, 9 (64%) said that new and/or additional funds were available to cover increases in the budget, while 7 (50%) used existing library funds, and 6 (43%) mentioned an ongoing commitment or endowment. One-time university funds, outside funding, and other sources were also mentioned. New locations were also added by assuming administrative control over or by a change of institutional status in existing libraries. On 11 campuses, circulation is the only service provided in every branch. Reference services (9 respondents), web pages (8), bibliographic instruction (8), copy services (8), and reserves (8) are also often provided. Only one new location includes acquisition and cataloging services.

Details of Closed Locations

Closing a location requires the disposition of collections, space, and services. All but one library employed a combination of strategies to dispose of collections. All 11 responding institutions shared the strategy of merging the material with another existing collection. Weeding or disposal was the second most common strategy. Three campuses transferred collections to remote storage, gave them to another library or institution, and/or replaced them with electronic resources.

Vacated collections space was most frequently taken over by the hosting academic department or school (73%). This suggests that on some level the academic department served by the library began competing for the same physical space. In many of these cases it would seem that the library and its services were deemed dispensable. Surely in some of these scenarios, departments became torn between the desire to maintain the convenience of adjacent library services and coveting additional space for classrooms and faculty offices. In two cases the library took over the space. In one case it went to the university. In no case were facilities torn down.

In all but one case the services previously provided by a closed location were moved to another location (91%). In 3 of 10 libraries, electronic library services were also substituted for former onsite services. Only one institution ceased to offer the services previously provided.

Details of Mergers

As in the case of locations being closed, the collection space vacated after a merger was usually taken over by the academic department or school (71%). In two reported cases, the department and main library share the vacated space. In one, the department and the university share it.

Anticipated Changes

One in three (36%) of the reporting institutions plan to change the number of discrete collection or branch locations in the coming five years (2000–04). Of the changes, 13% will be additions, 21% closings, and 66% mergers. Just over half of the changes (52%) will occur in science and technology subject areas, 21% in arts and humanities areas, 15% in area studies, and 11% in social studies. Libraries are also planning renovations and improvements in social sciences (26%), area studies (26%), science and technology (21%), undergraduate libraries (11%), combined collections (11%), and arts and humanities (5%).

Use of one-time university funds and existing library funds are the most common funding strategies anticipated for adding collection locations. Three respondents expect funds from ongoing commitments or endowments. Two expect new and/or additional funds to be added to the budget. Only one expects to secure outside funding.

All respondents plan to merge collections from closed locations with another collection. All but three expect to combine this strategy with weeding or disposal of resources (67%), replacement with electronic resources (44%), transfer to remote storage (33%), or shipment to another library or institution (33%).

Impact of Electronic Resources

More than half of those responding (53%) said that the availability of electronic resources is influencing the planning process for future discrete collection locations. Many campuses have moratoriums on new branch libraries as a matter of policy, and, maybe as a consequence, respondents did not talk specifically about adding, closing or merging collection locations. Instead, comments focused on ways to improve services to branch constituencies.

Comments touched on four primary topics: increased number of electronic resources, improved access to digital information, continuing demands on space in physical facilities, and the changing nature of scholarly communication. Every response incorporated at least two of these factors, underscoring the complexity of the electronic information environment.

The library's ability to make resources widely available often depends on the technical capabilities of the institution. "As the campus infrastructure improves," wrote one respondent, "more resources will be available to the desktop and services will be delivered from a central point to remote locations." Many echoed the theme of access by remote users, whether those users are across the street or on the other side of the globe. As a specific example, the use of Ariel and other document transmission technologies will allow library resources to be delivered to the researcher's office.

The increasing availability of electronic resources is causing libraries to carefully consider the space needed for collection growth. Maintaining both print and electronic collections places even greater demands on libraries' limited on-campus space. The availability of electronic resources (e.g., via JSTOR) is influencing the selection of materials to be transferred to storage facilities. Among institutions intentionally looking to replace print with electronic information sources, selection decisions are based, in part, on the percentage of the print collection that can be transferred offsite. User behaviors and needs are also changing. At least one library is downsizing its print collection in favor of electronic resources at the request of users who want more group study space.

Technology is having a profound impact on scholarship and scholarly communication. One person noted "the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching," particularly in the sciences. Another respondent offered the opinion that "desktop delivery of journal contents reduces the need for departmental libraries that consist primarily of journals." Yet a third person suggested that "the availability of online resources and document delivery services may make print collections obsolete in some disciplines."

The future of branch libraries and discrete collection locations was on the minds of many answering the survey. One respondent articulated a vision of a "library system which occupies fewer, more consolidated locations, and [which] includes, as a cornerstone, electronic distribution of many services to the researcher's desktop." Another suggested that "reading rooms on and off campus will be more service- or access-oriented than collections-oriented." That idea has been implemented by one institution in which branch collections duplicated the main collection. While it appears that no branches were closed, collections in each location were weeded and now consist of small core print collections supplemented by desktop access to a "virtual library."

Evaluation Process

Only a few institutions reported a formal evaluation process for deciding which branch locations to add, close, or merge. However, 57% reported using some method of evaluation. The two most frequently used techniques mentioned were cost and benefit analysis (52%) and service-use data analysis (48%). Other techniques reported were collection-use data analysis (38%), departmental user surveys (34%), locally developed guidelines (28%), focus groups (24%), published guidelines (21%), and campus-wide user surveys (14%).

The variety and number of methods of evaluation suggest that libraries are attempting to use objective measures when looking at the future of collections. Yet, as reported earlier, the most influential decision-making factor, at least for closures and mergers, is money.

Observations

This survey covered a complex and evolving set of issues that are difficult to quantify or summarize. The relationship between a hosting department or school and its branch library underscores this complexity. It is often said on university campuses that the library is every department's second priority. When given the choice between space for departmental needs and space for a branch library, the faculty choose offices, laboratories, and classrooms over the library time after time. Branch libraries are considered a source of pride and status for a department or school, but they require resources—most notably space—that outpace a department's ability to provide them, both on an ongoing basis and in an attempt to meet increasing demands. If space were not an issue, then the library would have the opportunity to focus on providing needed services and could create a sense of place whether real or virtual.

The impact of technology upon the future of libraries will be profound. We are beginning to see some effects in branch libraries. Many branch library services are no longer necessarily bound by a physical location or building. While our understanding of branch libraries is strongly tied to the idea of bricks and mortar, opportunities and capabilities to deliver focused services to a specific community on the university campus (and around the world) are greater today than ever before. The challenge is to develop tailored services and resources that meet current user needs and that can easily be modified or transformed as user demands change.

Survey Results

Branch libraries exist in academia for many reasons. Because situations sometimes change, libraries wrestle with the question of centralization versus decentralization of services and collections. Periodically, each institution weighs the tradeoffs between user needs and organizational limitations. New technological capabilities also spark renewed evaluations.

As the results of the 1983 SPEC Kit on branch libraries illustrate (*Branch Libraries*, SPEC Kit 99, November-December 1983), there is no single best course of action. During the five years prior to the publication of that report, some institutions closed or merged libraries, centralizing locations as well as operations. Other universities added new locations and branches, using online catalogs to provide intellectual integration of library collections.

Fifteen years ago, libraries used automated circulation systems to combine branch library operations. The current generation of technological tools gives libraries the ability to integrate resources from both inside and outside the library. Internet gateways and web sites significantly influence the ways patrons perceive and use libraries. These changing user attitudes and behaviors compel libraries to look once again at issues of centralization and decentralization.

This survey intentionally attempts to broaden the inquiry to include not only "branch libraries," but also discrete collections housed in "main libraries." The results will provide a snapshot of current definitions, subject areas, services, and administration of discrete and branch collections. It will also document reasons and influences for changes, both past and anticipated.

This survey was designed by Karen S. Croneis, Associate Dean for Collections and Information Services, University of Alabama, and Bradley H. Short, Music Librarian, Gaylord Music Library, Washington University in St. Louis.

Please submit this survey and send the requested documentation by August 6, 1999. As always, individual responses to the survey will be treated confidentially.

Note: Fifty-four of the 122 ARL member libraries (44%) responded to the survey.

1. At your institution, are there discrete library collections, arranged separately (housed within main library or elsewhere) and staffed regular hours? Please include undergraduate library collections, but omit medical, law, special collections, and government documents collections, since ARL already documents these collections.

Yes	51	94%
No	3	6%

If yes, how many? (n=51)

Range	1–24
Mean	7.9
Median	6
Total collections	406

Definition of Terms

2. What term (or terms) does your institution use to designate discrete collection locations, including those called "branch libraries?" For those terms that you use, indicate the number of collection locations in each category. For example, six departmental libraries, eight reading rooms. (n=51)

Term	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Branch library	39	1–15	4.8	4	187
Unit	12	1–9	3.0	2	36
Reading room	10	1–7	2.6	1.5	26
Departmental library	9	1–12	6.2	7	56
Subject library	8	1–4	2.4	2.5	19
School library	4	1–7	3.5	3	14
College library	2	1–6	3.5	3.5	7
Other Annex Campus library Collection Divisional library Information center	12	1–17	4.1	3	49

3. How does your institution define "branch library?"

See the executive summary in this Kit for a description of responses.

Subject Areas

4. How many discrete collection/branch locations are there in each subject area at your institution? (n=51)

	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Science and technology	42	1-11	3.9	3	163
Arts and humanities	38	1-6	1.8	1	70
Social sciences	31	1-5	2.0	1	63
Combined/mixed	17	1-7	2.3	1	39
Area studies	15	1-6	2.1	2	31
Undergraduate	8	1-2	1.1	1	9
Other Career center Maps Media resources Storage	11	1-7	2.5	2	27

Services

5. Which of the following services are provided at discrete collection/branch locations in your institution? Indicate the number of locations that offer each category of service. (n=51)

	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Reference	51	1–28	7.9	6	401
Bibliographic instruction	51	1–25	6.7	5	342
Circulation	51	1–23	6.9	6	352
Reserves	50	1–20	6.3	5	314
Web pages	48	1–30	7.5	5	360
Copy services	42	1–22	7.1	5	300
Interlibrary loan	33	1–20	5.7	4	188
Acquisitions	21	1–13	3.8	2	80
Cataloging/technical services	18	1–10	2.6	2	48

Administration

6. What are the reporting relationships of the discrete collection/branch locations? Please indicate how many of each category (e.g., unit, branch, etc.) report to the main library (or central unit that is a member of ARL) and how many report to another unit (e.g., chemistry department). For example, three subject libraries report to main library, while two report to another unit. (n=51)

Reports to Main/ARL Library	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Branch library	36	1–15	4.8	4	174
Unit	14	1–9	3.0	2	42
Departmental library	8	1–11	6.1	7	49
Reading room	6	1–7	2.7	1.5	16
Subject library	6	1–4	2.8	3	17
School library	3	1–7	3.7	3	11
College library	3	1–2	1.7	2	5

Reports to Another Unit	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Departmental library	4	1–5	2.8	2.5	11
Branch library	3	1–5	3.7	5.0	11
Reading room	4	1–5	2.3	1.5	9
School library	2	1–2	1.5	1.5	3
Subject library	1	1	1.0		1
College library	0				
Unit	0				

7. What is the total number of staff (FTE) in all discrete collection/branch locations combined and in all libraries (excluding law and medical) at your institution? (n=50)

FTE in branch/discrete	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Professional librarian	44	1–43	13	10	587
Support staff	41	1–331	24	11	976
Undergraduate student assistant	28	1–64	16	13	440
Graduate student assistant	15	.5–10	3	3	47
Other professional	12	1–34	7	3	79
Clerical (library or department)	5	1–74	24	12	119

FTE total	Responses	Range	Mean	Median	Total
Professional librarian	39	2–109	52	50	2,076
Support staff	36	1–270	103	106	3,600
Undergraduate Student Assistant	27	2–336	73	49	1,977
Graduate Student Assistant	16	2–45	9	5	141
Other professional	21	1–147	19	13	407
Clerical (library or department)	5	2–135	52	55	262

Past Changes

8. Have there been any changes in the number of discrete collection/branch locations at your institution during the past five years (1995–99)? If yes, indicate the number of additions, closures, or mergers in each subject area. (n=51)

Yes	22	43%
No	29	57%

	Additions	Closures	Mergers
Science and technology	3	11	4
Social sciences	2	2	6
Arts and humanities	2	1	3
Combined/mixed	2	1	2
Area studies	2	1	0
Undergraduate	0	3	0

9. The following are factors that might influence an institution's decision to add, close, or merge collection locations. Please indicate the three most influential factors in your institution for each type of decision. Use "#1" to indicate the most influential, "#2" the second most influential, and "#3" the third most influential factor. (n=44)

Add Location	#1	#2	#3	Weighted Average
Academic or program change	9	3	6	1.83
Service or access considerations	8	10	4	1.82
Political or administrative considerations of the university	8	5	4	1.77
Costs or funding	7	4	3	1.71
Political or administrative considerations of the department or school	2	7	2	2.00
Political or administrative considerations of the library	2	4	5	2.27
Technology or computer considerations	2	3	1	1.83

(cont'd)

Close Location	#1	#2	#3	Weighted Average
Costs or funding	14	9	3	1.58
Academic or program change	5	5	4	1.93
Political or administrative considerations of the university	6	2	2	1.60
Service or access considerations	4	9	4	2.00
Political or administrative considerations of the department or school	4	1	3	1.88
Political or administrative considerations of the library	2	4	5	2.27
Technology or computer considerations	1	2	4	2.43

Merge Locations	#1	#2	#3	Weighted Average
Costs or funding	10	8	2	1.60
Service or access considerations	9	7	5	1.81
Political or administrative considerations of the library	5	4	3	1.83
Academic or program change	5	4	3	1.83
Political or administrative considerations of the university	4	3	5	2.08
Political or administrative considerations of the department or school	1	2	3	2.33
Technology or computer considerations	0	2	5	2.71

If discrete collection or branch locations were **added**, please answer questions 10 and 11. Otherwise, continue to question 12.

10. How were new locations funded? Check all that apply. (n=14)

New or additional funds added to the budget	9	64%
Existing library funds	7	50%
Ongoing commitment/endowments	6	43%
One-time university funds	3	21%
Outside funding	2	14%
Other	2	14%
By the college		
University capital campaign		

11. Which services moved to the new location(s)? Indicate the number of new locations providing each type of service. (n=11)

	Responses	**Range**	**Mean**	**Median**
Circulation	11	1–4	1.5	1
Reference	9	1–4	1.7	1
Web pages	8	1–4	1.8	1.5
Bibliographic instruction	8	1–4	1.8	1.5
Copy services	8	1–4	1.6	1
Reserves	8	1–4	1.5	1
Interlibrary loan	4	1–2	1.25	1
Acquisitions	1	1	1	
Cataloging or technical services	1	1	1	

If discrete collection/branch locations were **closed**, please answer questions 12 through 14. Otherwise, continue to question 15.

12. What became of the collections? Check all that apply. (n=11)

Merged with another collection	11	100%
Weeded or disposed of	7	64%
Transferred to remote storage	3	27%
Given or offered to another library or institution	3	27%
Replaced with electronic resources	3	27%

13. What happened to the vacated collection space? Check all that apply. (n=11)

Taken over by the academic department or school	8	73%
Taken over by the library	2	18%
Taken over by the university	1	9%
Torn down	0	

14. What happened to the services provided by the closed location? Check all that apply. (n=11)

Moved to another location	10	91%
Replaced with electronic library services	3	27%
No longer being provided	1	9%

If discrete collection/branch locations were **merged**, please answer question 15. Otherwise, continue to question 16.

15. What happened to the vacated collection space? Check all that apply. (n=7)

Taken over by the academic department or school	5	71%
Taken over by the library	3	43%
Taken over by the university	1	14%
Torn down	0	

Anticipated Changes

16. Are there plans to change the number of discrete collection/branch locations at your institution in the coming five years (2000–04)? If yes, indicate the number of anticipated additions, closures, etc., in each subject area.

Yes	18	36%
No	32	64%

	Add	Close	Merge	Renovate or Improve
Social sciences	0	1	6	5
Arts and humanities	2	3	8	1
Area studies	0	4	5	5
Science and technology	5	5	22	4
Undergraduate	0	0	0	2
Combined/mixed	1	0	0	2

17. How will new locations be funded? Check all that apply. (n=11)

One-time university funds	7	64%
Existing library funds	7	64%
Ongoing commitment or endowments	3	27%
New or additional funds added to the budget	2	18%
Outside funding	1	9%
Other	1	9%

18. How will collections from closed locations be disposed of? Check all that apply. (n=9)

Merged with another collection	9	100%
Weeded or disposed of	6	67%
Replaced with electronic resources	4	44%
Transferred to remote storage	3	33%
Given or offered to another library or institution	3	33%

19. Is the availability of electronic resources influencing the planning process for future discrete collection or branch locations?

Yes	17	53%
No	15	47%

20. What process or methods are used for evaluating which discrete collection/branch locations should be added, closed, or merged? Check all that apply. (n=29)

Cost or benefit analysis	15	52%
Service use data analysis	14	48%
Collection use data analysis	11	38%
Departmental user survey	10	34%
Locally developed guidelines	8	28%
Focus group	7	24%
Published guidelines	6	21%
Campus-wide user survey	4	14%
Other	6	21%
None	6	21%

21. Would you be interested in participating in a detailed statistical survey of branch library collections, staff, services, and budget?

Yes	19	41%
No	27	59%

Responding Institutions

University of Alabama
University of Alberta
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Brown University
University of California–Riverside
University of California–San Diego
Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information
Case Western Reserve University
Colorado State University
Duke University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
University of Georgia
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Hawaii
University of Houston
Indiana University
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
University of Kentucky
Laval University
McMaster University
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
National Library of Canada
National Library of Medicine
University of New Mexico
New York University
University of North Carolina
Ohio University
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Purdue University
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Stony Brook
University of Tennessee
Texas A&M University
Texas Tech University
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
Virginia Tech
University of Washington
Washington State University
Washington University
University of Waterloo
Wayne State University
York University

SPEC

REPRESENTATIVE DOCUMENTS

Policies and Procedures

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Branch Facilities Support & Development Policy

Introduction

A specifically stated policy on the support of extramural collections, both branch libraries and reading rooms, is essential since such facilities tend to proliferate in number and size without adequate regard for their long-term usefulness, the degree of support required or the overall impact they have on the limited resources of the University. The following policy is designed to assure that University funds and Library resources are designated for such services that are clearly necessary and essential for teaching and/or research needs.

Types of Collections

Branch Libraries are major facilities located at a distance from the main University campus. These facilities have primary responsibility for branch library needs in the subject concerned. Their size ranges from 10,000 to 30,000 volumes with the number of current serials not exceeding 500 titles. The Parks Library or other external collections may have works in the same subjects because of interdisciplinary needs or other special purposes. Some duplication, therefore, for branch libraries is unavoidable. Seating should be provided for at least 15% of primary clientele with a minimum of 75 seats. Branch libraries are eligible for complete support by the University Library with respect to book funds, book selection, technical processing and professional staffing. However, some support could come from special endowments, gifts or grant funds.

Research Reading Rooms contain books and other library materials that may be heavily duplicated in the Parks Library and serve curricular, current awareness and primary research needs of one or several related departments. Such material should support some of the work of the departments concerned but would not provide for all research needs at advanced levels. The size of these facilities ranges from 5,000 to 25,000 volumes and the number of current serials from 150 to 350 titles. Seating provided should serve at least 10% of primary clientele with a minimum of 50 seats. A research reading room is entitled to receive support in regard to book funds and technical processing. It is eligible, funds permitting, for service staffing by Library Assistants under the general direction of a professional librarian in the Parks Library. This type of collection is reserved only for existing research reading rooms. No new reading rooms at this level can be authorized at the present time.

Reading Rooms are narrow in scope and range in size from 3,000 to 10,000 volumes; their serials collections should have no more than 250 currently received titles. These collections contain a high proportion of reference works, manuals and other frequently needed sources of information serving current awareness purposes. Materials in these collections are duplicated in the Parks Library except for highly specialized materials relevant only to the work of particular departments. There should be seating for at least 5% of the primary clientele with a minimum of 50 seats. The reading room may receive support in respect to book funds, technical processing for materials procured by the Parks Library and, if funds permit, service staffing by Library Assistants under the general direction of a professional librarian in the Parks Library.

Departmental Collections. Many academic departments and other offices of the University have small collections of books and other materials. These collections usually have resulted from gifts of faculty members, students or others and from purchases by departmental funds. These collections constitute a convenient reference source for departments concerned. They cannot, however, be supported, processed or serviced in any manner by the University Library. On occasion the Library may extend advice and consultation to the departments concerned as to the organization of its materials. Custody of these collections is entirely in the hands of the department, office, laboratory or institute to which they belong.

Conditions Required for Collection Support

The following conditions must be met to obtain the indicated support for the branch libraries, research reading rooms and reading rooms by the University Library.

A. Materials must be accessible to the University community at large through listing them in the public catalogs of the University Library. Some exceptions can be made for ephemeral materials procured by the branch libraries or reading rooms themselves, subject to potential review by the Parks Library.

B. Facilities must be accessible to all members of the University community and open preferably for the same hours as the Parks Library or at least for a minimum of 40 hours per week during the regular academic semesters.

C. The housing and custody of the collections must be adequate to protect University property. Control of the collection must be maintained through adequate circulation records, proper organization, regular shelving and shelf-reading. The circulation policy of each facility must be consistent with the general Library policy and will be clearly stated in the Parks Library policy paper on loans and fines.

D. There are several specific conditions relating to the physical environment of the facilities that should be met. They include:

1. Adequate space for stacks, study and service as defined for each facility.
2. Sufficient shelving to provide for collections as defined for each type of facility.
3. Adequate seating as indicated for each type of facility.
4. Furnishings conductive to study and appropriate lighting, heating, ventilation and acoustical control.

E. Existing facilities should be reviewed on a regular basis to assure that they meet minimum criteria. Such reviews will be the responsibility of the Assistant Director for Collections in cooperation with other appropriate personnel. Any facility that does not meet these criteria is subject to review by the Dean of Library Services with a view to revising its status.

Procedures: Changing Collection Status

Approval of New Branch Collections

The following steps are required for obtaining a change of status of an extramural collection and for approval of new extramural collections.

A. A request for change of status for an existing extramural collection or for establishment of a new collection must be presented to the Dean of Library Services by the executive officers of the college or the departments concerned. The request shall be examined by the appropriate members of the Library staff in consultation with the college or departments involved. Subsequently, a report is to be prepared and forwarded with recommendations to the Dean of Library Services. This report should contain detailed analysis of costs necessary to implement the proposal and to maintain the new collection or the changed status for an existing facility on a long term basis.

B. The Dean of Library Services with other appropriate Library staff members will review the information provided. The Dean will also consult as necessary with the college executive officers or members of the academic department concerned.

C. The Dean will transmit full information to the University Library Committee and will confer with and seek advice from this group.

D. The final decision will be made by the Dean, who will discuss the matter with the college or departments involved and make clear the basis of the decision.

Criteria for Determining Collection Status and Level of Support

The following points will be given special consideration by the Dean of Library Services and the University Library Committee in considering the status and level of support for existing or new branch collections:

Factors of major importance:

A. Geographical distance from the Parks Library of a college or another major University facility which requires substantial use of library materials.

B. Quantity and quality of significant research library materials currently housed in the extramural collection serving the needs of several related departments offering doctoral or professional degree programs.

C. Special factors related to the activities of the departments concerned, e.g., accreditation by professional associations, proximity to laboratories, research quarters or intensity of demonstrated use.

D. Implications for the Parks Library with respect to financial support, fragmentation of resources, staff loads and other similar factors.

E. Number of faculty members, graduate or undergraduate students in a given department or group of departments located at a distance from the Parks Library with unique or special library needs that can best be met by an extramural collections of duplicated materials.

In each case, the needs of the college/department, the total resources of the Library and the effect on students and faculty outside the college/department involved must be considered in order to attain maximum benefits with minimum disadvantages for the entire University.

General Principles and Policies

All reading rooms and branch libraries are governed by the following principles and policies:

A. Extramural facilities exist for the purpose of providing relatively limited collections and services according to the category to which they have been assigned. Persons using these facilities should be aware that a particular extramural collection cannot meet all needs as far as service and subject content are concerned.

B. Each of the branch libraries and reading rooms will maintain a written policy as to specific purpose, scope and limits of its collections as well as the type of materials which will be added in the future. The policy will also spell out hours of opening, loan periods, fine schedules and other rules of operation. The policy statements will be developed in consultation with the faculty members from the academic departments using these facilities.

C. Materials held in extramural collections will not always be duplicated in the Parks Library. Some highly specialized materials of little interest to those outside of the subject field may be located only in that facility. In the case of materials receiving interdisciplinary use, duplications will be required; however, limitations on the extensiveness of duplicated collections are necessary because of the cost element involved.

D. Serials collections in such facilities should not be expected to support extensive literature searches or to house titles in esoteric or peripheral subject fields. For these latter purposes, the Parks Library should continue to be utilized as the central back-up resource where long runs of back sets of serials are maintained on a reference basis. The Library will attempt to duplicate bound back files of serials for research reading rooms and branch libraries where these are proven to be definitely needed and heavily used. There will be no attempt to retain back sets of bound journals for other external facilities. The faculty will be queried as to the need for specific titles in extramural collections. Retirement to the Parks Library of older or little-used serials files is the prerogative of the Library upon adequate notification to the users. The faculty will be encouraged to work with the Library Collection Development staff to keep such collections active and useful.

E. The administration of authorized extramural facilities, including staffing and acquisition of new materials, is properly the responsibility of the Library. It is highly desirable, therefore, that the operation of these facilities be under the control of the Library so that effective management, staff training and development of these collections can be subjected to overall Library policies and professional Library review.

Existing Extramural Collections

Several extramural collections are now in existence on the ISU campus for which the University Library assumes varying degrees of responsibility:

Design Reading Room
Economics and Sociology Reading Room
Mathematics Reading Room
Physical Sciences Reading Room
Veterinary Medical Library

Design Reading Room

The Design Reading Room is predominantly a duplicate collection of selected books and journals supporting course work in the College of Design and providing some current awareness materials to students and faculty.

Economics and Sociology Reading Room

The Economics and Sociology Reading Room contains a duplicate collection of selected current books and journals in these two disciplines and anthropology with primary orientation to the current awareness needs of faculty and graduate students in the departments.

Mathematics Reading Room

The Mathematics Reading Room is predominantly a collection of non-duplicated, highly specialized mathematics journals and other serials serving current awareness and some research needs of the Mathematics Department faculty and graduate students.

Physical Sciences Reading Room

The Physical Sciences Reading Room is an outgrowth of a basic collection initially established to support the work of the Ames Laboratory of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission but which is now a part of and supported by the University Library. It is primarily a collection of books and journals in chemistry, physics and related fields for use by faculty and graduate students.

Veterinary Medical Library

The Veterinary Medical Library is a major branch library supporting course work and research of the College of Veterinary Medicine. Life sciences materials of importance to many departments of the University are duplicated extensively for this collection. Materials in clinical medicine and in veterinary sciences are acquired for the collection as only copies.

In accordance with the "Branch Facilities Support and Development Policy", the Design and the Economics and Sociology Reading Rooms are designated as Reading Rooms; the Mathematics and Physical Sciences Reading Rooms will be designated as Research Reading Rooms, and the Veterinary Medical Library as a Branch Library.

Revised: 20 June 1983

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY **ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS**	IDENTIFICATION AR II-2.0-1	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE 2/25/99	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED AR II-8.0-3 12/1/83 AR II 2.0-1 6/13/89

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING BRANCH LIBRARIES AND EDUCATIONAL UNIT LIBRARY COLLECTIONS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

I. Purpose and Intent

Branch libraries are units of the University of Kentucky University System Libraries, physically distinct from the William T. Young Library and the Medical Center Library, having two purposes: to provide subject-oriented collections of informational resources for an identified group of primary users and to extend the instructional, research, and public service support functions of the William T. Young Library and the Medical Center Library.

The intent in establishing a branch library is to meet a demonstrable need for access to materials and services which are not, or cannot be, provided by King Library or the Medical Center Library and a demonstrated need to have library support in close proximity to the educational unit.

Future developments in the form of published literature, in library techniques, and in the rapid transmission of printed materials through new electronic devices should minimize the necessity for outlying collections of library materials. The University wishes to take advantage of these advances in a responsible way and is committed to an orderly development of the University System Libraries (comprised of the William T. Young Library, the Medical Center Library, and their branches). This fact, in conjunction with the underlying principles of sound library development, has implications for branch library and educational unit library collection planning policies. The underlying principles are as follows:

The primary mission of the University System Libraries is to provide bibliographical, physical, and intellectual access to recorded information, in whatever form, to support the present and anticipate educational, research, and service functions of the University of Kentucky.

Scholarly needs and interdisciplinary approaches to learning are generally best served by access to a wide range of resources, including the literature of a special subject and all subjects of peripheral interest.

Accessibility of all institutional-owned library resources for all users must be a prime consideration. This implies physical access for extended hours and bibliographic access through a centralized on-line catalog.

Every duplicated title limits funds for other titles to be added to the collection; therefore, duplicating titles invariably diminishes the breadth of the collection. Conversely, pooling of material of overlapping subject fields makes possible expansion of available resources.

Coordination, cooperation, and communication are difficult to achieve in a system with a number of outlying facilities.

The various academic disciplines should play a strong role in determining the scope and quality of the collections of the University System Libraries and the quantity of services provided in support of the Libraries' major missions and functions.

The University System Libraries are committed to fiscal responsibility in cost-effective utilization of staff and equipment in both the central library and in the branches.

Educational unit library collections are small libraries, sometimes called reading rooms or resource centers, supported by University funds but not affiliated with the University System Libraries. Materials in these libraries are defined as those working tools that faculty must consult on a daily or very frequent basis in support of their teaching and research.

II. Policy Statements

A. General Policies

1. Branch Libraries

The University has a policy of not further decentralizing library facilities on the Lexington campus unless special services are needed by a program that the King Library or the Medical Center Library cannot provide or provide as well as a branch library. A decision on establishing a branch library is reached only after a present and long-range study of available resources and user needs.

2. Educational Unit Library Collections Independent of the University System Libraries

If justified, small collections (limited to dictionaries, textbooks, workbooks, handbooks, and other working tools regularly used by faculty) may be procured for educational unit use in accordance with the provisions of Section IV, entitled Procedures for Establishing an Independent Educational Unit Library Collection.

B. Administrative and Organizational Policies

1. Management of Resources

The responsibility for the management of all University System Libraries resources shall rest with the University System Libraries administration. Library services are most efficiently utilized when all library resources are considered part of one system, with consistent policies for collection development, user access, accounting, systems analysis, and the like. Centralized planning and direction facilitate the most effective use of future financial resources allocated for library services.

2. Administrative Structure

Ordinarily, any branch library should be administratively part of the William T. Young Library or the Medical Center Library. Branch library personnel should report to the administration of the William T. Young Library (directly or through one of its branches) or the Medical Center Library. This relationship should be defined in job descriptions and outlined on organization charts.

Designing, developing, and administering library programs and adequate collections to meet changing user expectations and demands requires continuing professional growth of librarians charged with these responsibilities. The most effective means of assuring this growth is by participation within a central group.

3. Financial Support

Implicit with the creation of a branch library is a commitment to funding its development, ongoing services, and growth while maintaining adequate support levels for library services required by the total University community. Continuing book and personnel budgets are imperative for a branch library, with additional book funds initially provided for necessary duplication as well as enrichment of the existing collection.

C. Operational Policies

1. Statement of Purpose

Written statements of purpose, including goals and objectives, are necessary guides for a branch library's operation. These should state the educational unit's goals and the branch library's role within this context. These statements should be determined carefully, described clearly, and updated regularly.

2. Collection Development

Coordination of the branch library's materials selection policy with the University System Libraries' selection policy assures the most effective use of the University's collection development resources by preventing unnecessary duplication of materials and by preventing gaps in subject coverage within the library collections.

3. Technical Processing

In most cases, centralized acquisition and processing of library materials proves to be most economical. All holdings of a library should be listed in the on-line catalog which is maintained by the University system libraries.

4. Services

Branch libraries are expected to maintain the same standards of service as the University System Libraries with respect to hours of service, assistance to users, and accessibility to and utilization of informational materials by the total University community.

5. Staff

The branch library's staff is a primary link between user needs and the branch library's collections. Competent and adequate staffing is necessary to ensure the proper development and use of the branch library's collection.

6. Physical Quarters

Physical quarters designed to provide specialized branch library needs are essential to a successful branch library operation. Criteria to be met include: space for present and future growth in terms of collection, equipment, and patron use; accessibility to primary users; noise control; temperature and humidity control; collection security; and an interior conducive to study.

D. Review Policy

A formal, structured review and evaluation of each branch library and independent educational unit library collection shall be scheduled every five years. If justified reasons arise, a review at other than the regular period may be initiated by the chief administrative officer of the educational unit, by the appropriate chancellor, or by the Director of Libraries or the Director of the Medical Center Library.

III. Procedures for Establishing a Branch Library

A. Needs Analysis

To determine whether it is in the best interest of the University to establish a branch library, a needs analysis must be made. This analysis accounts for primary clientele requirements as well as those of the entire academic community and includes supporting data concerning the following points.

1. Description of Proposed Branch Library

A description of proposed branch library services shall include:

a. Its primary clientele and their information needs.

b. Geographical location of the proposed branch library in relation to primary clientele and to the total community of users.

c. Collection development, administrative organization, and operation plans including projections of maximum size.

d. User services to be provided, including hours of access and on-site staffing requirements.

e. Access to union catalogs, specialized information systems, and delivery services including interlibrary loan.

f. Space and equipment requirements, including growth projections to meet changing needs.

g. Total development and operating costs, including long-range projections to meet growth needs.

2. Description of Existing Library Services

A description of existing library services shall include:

a. Informational needs of the total University community defining both general and special requirements.

b. Geographical location of present library facilities in relation to user locations.

c. Collection development policies and physical organization of the collection, including cross-disciplinary needs of the academic community and collection growth projections.

d. User services, including hours of access and on-site staffing requirements.

e. Electronic catalog access, delivery systems, interinstitutional networking participation, and specialized information systems.

f. Space and equipment requirements, including growth projections to meet changing needs.

3. Comparative Analysis of Existing and Proposed Library Services

A comparative analysis of proposed branch library services and existing library services shall be provided using each of the factors identified in points one and two. Note shall be made of the following:

a. Restrictions on user access to collections and services such as geographical location, transportation facilities, delivery service for library materials, hours of service, staffing assistance, and special use privileges for a defined group of clientele.

b. Collection development and arrangement requirements, including the cost of duplicating existing library resources and developing new subject collections.

c. Space and equipment requirements, including the cost of establishing and maintaining new facilities in fiscal terms and in use of existing space presently used in meeting other academic needs.

d. Financial support requirements, including long-range projections to meet growth needs. An educational unit may choose to fund a position or positions and all or part of the book budget by a recurring transfer from user organization budgets to the William T. Young Library or the Medical Center Library. Personnel in such positions report administratively to the administration of the William T. Young Library or the Medical Center Library. This decision should be reflected in a review of the University's long-range projections for financial support of its library program.

B. Proposal Approval

A proposal to create a branch library must have the approval of the chief administrative officer of the initiating educational unit, the dean of the college, and any other appropriate councils or bodies. The proposal shall be forwarded by the appropriate dean or administrative officer to the Director of Libraries or the Director of the Medical Center Library. The Director shall supply a statement of administrative feasibility with a recommendation to the appropriate chancellor who shall make the final decision.

IV. Procedures for Establishing an Independent Educational Unit Library Collection

A. Documentation of Need

An educational unit proposing to establish an independent educational unit library collection shall prepare a documentation of need for such a collection, including supporting data parallel to that required for the establishment of a branch library.

B. Materials Purchased

Materials purchased for independent educational unit library collections shall be limited to dictionaries, textbooks, workbooks, handbooks, and other working tools used by faculty on a daily or very frequent basis in support of teaching and research.

C. Financial Support Statement

A statement covering financial support is a vital part of a proposal to establish an independent educational unit library collection. University educational units which use their own resources to establish independent educational unit library collections outside the established University System Libraries must accept complete responsibility for operating and maintaining these collections. The University System Libraries normally shall not provide technical services or personnel in support of these collections.

D. Inclusion in the Library Catalog

In order to effectively utilize the University's information resources, records of books purchased for independent educational unit library collections shall be supplied to the University System Libraries for inclusion in the on-line Catalog.

E. Proposal Approval

A proposal to create an independent educational unit library collection must have the approval of the chief administrative officer of the initiating educational unit, the dean of the college, and any other appropriate councils or bodies. The proposal shall be forwarded by the appropriate dean or administrative officer to the Director of Libraries or the Director of the Medical Center Library.

The Director shall evaluate the relative costs and benefits of the proposed independent educational unit library collection and the extent to which alternative solutions have been explored. The Director shall forward a report of findings and a recommendation on the proposal to the appropriate chancellor for review in terms of the policies, criteria, and procedures in this Administrative Regulation. The appropriate chancellor shall make the final decision concerning the creation of an independent educational unit library collection.

V. Procedures for Reviewing and Evaluating Branch Libraries and Independent Educational Unit Library Collections

A. Needs Analysis

To determine whether it is in the best interest of the University to maintain, to improve, or to close a branch library or an independent educational unit library collection, a needs analysis must be made.

1. The Director of Libraries or the Director of the Medical Center Library shall be responsible for conducting the analysis of a branch library.

2. The chief administrative officer of the educational unit shall be responsible for conducting the analysis of the unit's independent library collection.

3. The analysis shall include supporting data parallel to that required for the establishment of a branch library.

B. Review Recommendations Approval

1. Branch Libraries

The Director of Libraries or the Director of the Medical Center Library shall forward review recommendations to the appropriate dean of the college or the chief administrative officer of the educational unit. The dean or chief administrative officer shall supply an advisory statement to the appropriate chancellor or vice president. The chancellor or vice president shall determine whether it is in the best interest of the University to maintain, to improve, or to close a branch library.

2. Independent Educational Unit Library Collections

The dean of the college or the chief administrative officer of the educational unit shall forward review recommendations to the Director of Libraries or the Director of the Medical Center Library. The Director shall supply an advisory statement to the appropriate chancellor or vice president. The chancellor or vice president shall determine whether it is in the best interest of the University to maintain, to improve, or to close an independent educational unit library collection.

Ohio University Policy and Procedure

Departmental Libraries: Guidelines & Requirements

Procedure No.:	14.101
Page No.:	1,2 and 3 of 3
Date Issued:	10/08/80
Issued By:	H.W. Lee

Previous Policy Previous Page Next Page Next Policy

Numeric Index Alpha Index

PURPOSE

To provide a policy and procedure for the approval, establishment, maintenance, and review of all departmental libraries on the Athens Campus.

DEFINITION

A departmental library is defined as a library service unit, with collections, which is organized primarily to serve the needs of one or more academic areas and is physically removed from the main library.

Excluded from the policy are variously named reading rooms or reference collections, each of which is operated by an academic unit, generally very small in number of items, not staffed and with no regular hours. Collections are largely gifts and are not cataloged.

POLICY

1. In the interest of cost-efficiency, of making most library resources and services available to all library users, and of maximizing the library's support for inter-disciplinary studies and research, a centralized library system on the Athens Campus is strongly favored.

2. Recognizing the legitimate needs of some academic areas for separate departmental libraries which require a minimum amount of duplication in collections, especially of the more expensive reference and indexing tools and journals, and where the additional cost of

operation and inconvenience to other users outside the academic departments are kept at a minimum, a number of departmental libraries shall be permitted if they follow the guidelines and meet the basic requirements stipulated below.

3. In general, this policy and procedure does not apply to those variously named reading rooms or reference collections as defined as long as they remain small collections of gift materials with little or no cost to the academic units which maintain them.

4. This policy and procedure statement shall be considered as a supplement of the **Statement of Libraries** approved by the Library Committee (5/12/67) and the University Executive Committee (10/4/67).

PROCEDURE

I. Guidelines:

1. Whenever possible, all library collections and services on the Athens Campus shall be centralized and coordinated by the main library.

[Here begins page 2 of the hardcopy version.]

---

2. All requests for the establishment of a new departmental library shall be made by the head of the academic unit to the Director of Libraries. In consultation with the Provost, the appropriate dean, and the University Library Committee, a review committee will be appointed by the Provost on the recommendation of the Library Director to review the request and to make recommendations. The Committee's report of its findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the Director of Libraries for forwarding to the Provost.

3. The review committee shall consider the request from the perspective of the following requirements of a departmental library:

   a. The primary users and their information needs.
   b. The geographical location related to primary users and to the total community of users.
   c. The development of the collection including projections of maximum size and the duplication of materials.
   d. The user services, including the hours of access and on-site staffing requirements.
   e. The space and equipment requirements, including projections to meet changing needs.
   f. The development and operating costs, including long range projections.
   g. The total impact upon the main library and its users.

4. The review committee subsequently will draft a recommendation regarding the establishment of a departmental library. A positive recommendation shall address the following:

   a. The purpose of the departmental library.
   b. The organization, staff, space, facilities, and services.

c. The proposed collection and its development.
d. The processing and the bibliographic control of the materials that will be housed there.
e. A proposed, detailed budget, including initial start-up costs and operational costs.

5. To ensure that all existing departmental libraries also meet the basic requirements stipulated herein, a periodic review shall be conducted every five years of all departmental libraries by a similar review committee appointed by the Provost.

6. Based on the findings and recommendations of the review committee together with the comments of the Director of Libraries, the Provost will make the final decision relative to the approval or disapproval of a new departmental library, or the expansion or contraction of an existing one.

[Here begins page 3 of the hardcopy version.]

7. As all costs associated with a new departmental library, or the expansion of existing ones, cannot be absorbed by the existing library budget, the funding of departmental libraries will be a major consideration in the recommendations of the Library Director and the final decision of the Provost.

II. Requirements:

1. All departmental libraries shall either be directly operated or be coordinated by the main library so that a high degree of standardization in technical processing, bibliographic control, and library policies can be achieved.

2. All library materials purchased with University funds shall be processed centrally by the main library and be included in the Union Catalogs to facilitate access and bibliographic control. Exceptions can be made for those materials that are considered laboratory tools or ephemeral materials.

3. Library collections in departmental libraries shall be accessible to users outside the academic area. The hours of departmental libraries shall be set according to actual needs and shall include evenings and weekends whenever necessary.

4. All departmental libraries shall be staffed or properly supervised at all times they are open and the staff shall receive training in basic library skills by the main library staff.

5. Expensive indexes and journals that are needed by a significant number of other users in the main library may be recalled after consultation and placed in the main library.

Return to the top.

Previous Policy Previous Page Next Page Next Policy

Numeric Index Alpha Index

On-line version revised May 10, 1999.

Please E-mail any comments or suggestions to "`polproc@www.ohiou.edu`".

---

ohio university
FRONT DOOR

Operating Policy and Procedure Manual: Branch Libraries

OP 66.02

SUBJECT: Branch Libraries

DATE: November 24, 1999

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Operating Policy/Procedure (OP) is to ensure understanding and a standardized approach to matters relating to the organization, funding and management of branch libraries.

REVIEW

This OP will be reviewed by September 1 of every odd-numbered year by the Vice Provost with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost by October 1.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. Definition

A branch library is defined as a collection associated with a specific discipline and with quarters separate from the University Library, consisting of a basic collection of information in various formats, a regular staffing level, including a professional librarian, and an established service schedule. A branch library is administered by the University Library.

Although a library otherwise defined as a branch library is to be responsive to the general policies and guidelines set forth, any library at a graduate professional school shall be operated pursuant to all standards appropriate to that professional school.

2. Establishment of a Branch Library

a. Needs Analysis

A needs analysis shall be made under the direction of the dean of the requesting college to determine if it is in the best interest of the University to establish a branch library. This analysis includes the requirements of the primary clientele as well as those of the entire academic community. Supporting data concerning the following points should accompany the needs analysis.

(1) Description of the Proposed Branch Library

A description of the proposed branch library and its services must include the user services to be provided, hours of operation, on-site staffing requirements, the primary users and their information needs, the location of the proposed branch in relation to the primary user, access to online catalogs, security, space and equipment requirements, and total development and operating costs including appropriate financial arrangements. Collection development, administrative organization and operation plans must also be examined.

(2) **Description of Existing Library Services**

A description of existing library services must contain the information needs of the University defining both general and special requirements, the geographic location of the present library facilities in relation to the user locations, user services, online catalogs and specialized information systems, collection development policies and physical organization of the collection, space and equipment requirements, and growth projections to meet changing times.

(3) **Comparative Analysis of Existing and Proposed Library Services**

A comparative analysis of proposed branch services and existing library services must be provided using all of the factors identified in Sections (1) and (2).

b. **Proposal Approval**

A branch library proposal, containing the needs analysis, must have the written approval of the dean of the requesting college. The written proposal will be transmitted to the Director of Libraries and the University Library Committee for review.

The Director of Libraries will evaluate the administrative and financial feasibility of the proposed branch library as well as all other pertinent data. The Director and the Library Committee will supply a statement of feasibility with a recommendation to the Provost, who will make the final decision.

3. **General Policies and Guidelines**

a. The University strongly endorses the concept of a centralized library system unless special services and materials are needed by a program that the University Library cannot provide or provide as well as a branch library.

b. Management responsibility of all branch library resources should rest with the University Libraries' Administration. Funds for the establishment of branch libraries must come primarily from the requesting college. Financial arrangements will be negotiated in each case among the Provost, the relevant dean and the Director of Libraries.

Library services may be most efficiently utilized when all library resources are considered part of one system, with consistent policies for collection development, user access, accounting and systems analysis. Centralized planning and direction usually facilitate the most effective use of financial resources allocated for library services. All funds that may be provided for development of library collections, for equipping, or for staffing libraries in the University shall be administered through the various accounts comprising the overall University libraries' budgets.

c. All branch libraries shall be administered by and be a part of the Texas Tech University Libraries. Branch library personnel shall report to the Administration of the Texas Tech University Libraries. This relationship should be defined in job descriptions and outlined on organization charts. When a branch library is created, a small committee, jointly formed by the Director of Libraries and the college dean, and consisting of library personnel and relevant faculty, should be formed to maintain ongoing advisory oversight of the branch library for one year.

d. All holdings, where appropriate, shall become part of the general library bibliographic database and be reflected in the campus-wide online catalog.

e. Branch libraries will be formally reviewed and evaluated every five years. For justified reasons, a review at other than the regular period may be initiated by the Provost, by the Director of Libraries, or by the dean of the appropriate college. This review will be for the purpose of evaluating the collection and services. The evalua- tion will also determine if this branch library continues to be in the best interest of the University.

Return to Subject Index

Return to Numerical Index

Page Maintained by: Marti Dillon

Page Administrator: Suzy Henson

Planning and Evaluation

TASK FORCE ON SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

Task Force Members:

Thom Deardorff
Kay Denfeld
Alvin Fritz
Steve Hiller
Margaret Hinshaw
Sarah Michalak
Glenda Pearson
Betsy Wilson, Chair
David Wood

University of Washington Libraries
Seattle, Washington 98195

February 23, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary Page 3
II. Background for the Service Location Evaluation 5
III. Establishment of the Task Force on Service Location Evaluation 6
IV. Goal of the Service Location Evaluation 6
V. Working Assumptions and Agreements 7
VI. Review of Branch Libraries for Consolidation 7
    Development of the Criteria for Service Location Evaluation 7
    Consolidation Potential 8
    Initial Application 8
    Consolidation Potential Ranking 11
    Application of Full Criteria 12
VII. What Would be Gained Through Consolidation? 12
    Service Enhancements 12
    Financial Cost Savings 14
    One Time Costs of Consolidation 18
VIII. What Would be Lost Through Consolidation? 18
    Customized Services 18
    Convenience and Proximity 18
    Integral Role of the Library 19
IX. Alternative Service Delivery Options and Costs of Implementation 19
    Primary Departments 20
    Central Library Services 20
X. Review of Internal Service Locations 22
XI. Considerations and Recommendations 23
    Specific Recommendations 24
    Consolidations Concerns and Strategies 26
    Implementation of the Recommendations 28

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Memo Charging Task Force
Appendix 2 Working Document on Service Location Evaluation
Appendix 3 Criteria for Service Location Evaluation
Appendix 4 Illustration of Proportion of Use for Primary Branch and Suzzallo and Allen Libraries
Appendix 5 Library Profiles
Appendix 6 Multiple Copy Serials in the U. W. Libraries
Appendix 7 One Time Consolidation Costs

I. Executive Summary

In August 1993 the Director of Libraries Betty Bengtson charged the Task Force on Service Location Evaluation to examine service locations and to evaluate whether consolidating some service locations would improve user services and/or result in cost savings. She stated, "the goal of any consolidation should be to enhance services, reduce expenditures, and avoid further erosion of service quality." The evaluation of service locations was spurred by directions and events in the current University and State environment: the 5% reduction in the 1993/95 Libraries operating budget; the requirement to fund upgrades in classified staff salaries with existing funds; and the passage of Initiative 601. Other factors that supported evaluation of the Libraries' service location configuration were the growth in interdisciplinary scholarship, and new developments in information technology.

The *Working Document on Service Location Evaluation*, *Criteria for Service Location Evaluation*, and a set of working assumptions and agreements guided the Task Force's evaluation and review of the branch libraries. The Odegaard Undergraduate Library and the Health Sciences Library and Information Center were excluded from this review, either as units to be consolidated into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries or as units to receive collections from branch libraries.

The Task Force identified three criteria from the *Criteria for Service Location Evaluation* that it considered most critical in consolidation of a unit into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries: number of primary users; amount of use by primary users of related collections and services in the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries; and proximity of the unit to the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries. The Task Force ranked the branch libraries for consolidation potential and conducted an in-depth review of those with the greatest apparent potential. In this in-depth review, the Task Force identified what would be gained through consolidation, what would be lost through consolidation, and alternative service delivery options.

Services enhancements that would be gained through consolidation include: improved hours of access; improved security for collections, equipment, staff, and users; adjacency to a copy center and more plentiful copy machines; ready access to the Suzzallo Computing Resources Center and the Allen Auditorium; improved environmental conditions for collections, equipment, staff, and users; better lighting, sound and heating control; improved work space, and additional shelving, especially for the five units that have severe space deficiencies; greater flexibility in space; and improved access for individuals with disabilities. In addition, a broad range of related collections would be brought together, including the collections currently dispersed in branches, CD-ROM products, electronic files, microforms, maps, and government publications.

Branch libraries are known for customized services, convenience for and proximity to users, and the integral role they play in the life of the department(s) served. The Task Force identified a wide range of alternative ways to replicate and enhance library service now delivered by the branches. Service enhancements which would help ameliorate the convenience and customization lost in consolidation include: information access and knowledge management consultation service; assistance with network connectivity; remote access to databases and other electronic services formerly located in the branch; table of contents access to primary journals; remote self-service circulation; document delivery; reserve liaison for affected units during the first year of consolidation; a telephone hot line dedicated to the primary clientele of consolidated branches; and enhanced central stack maintenance and search services.

Cost savings from consolidation would derive chiefly from greater efficiency of collection maintenance, some hourly budget savings, reduced duplication of materials, savings on telecommunications costs, and diminished need for equipment and supplies. Future savings were anticipated in not having to purchase security systems for the six units that lack them. The Task Force anticipates both immediate personnel savings, depending on the status of vacant librarian and classified staff positions at the time of consolidation, and longer term savings based on shifts in workload. The Task Force identified the one time costs of consolidating units and the costs of providing alternative service options.

Recommendations

How should the Libraries be configured to provide user services within the context of the evolving electronic library, significant shifts in scholarly communication, the increasing interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching, and the reality of available resources? Based on its review of service locations, the Task Force recommends that the Libraries proactively shape the library of the future rather than react in a piecemeal fashion to these changes. The Libraries should sculpt a future in which it can maintain and expand quality service rather than settle for a future that is defined and curtailed by the current configuration of library locations.

The Task Force recommends that the Libraries strategically move in the direction of a library system predicated on fewer, more consolidated physical locations that take advantage of a network infrastructure and electronic information systems to customize and deliver services directly to the desktop while still recognizing the value of the library as place.

The Task Force recommends several short range objectives: consolidate the Geography, Philosophy, and Political Sciences Libraries into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries; institute a document delivery service; offer remote self-service circulation; expedite the acquisition, processing, and shelving of monographs and serials; articulate a Libraries-wide service philosophy; examine and redefine the role of librarians in the context of this strategic direction; develop an integrated program statement for the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries; develop an integrated program statement for the Odegaard Undergraduate Library which builds on OUGL as a gateway for undergraduates; and ensure that the preplanning program review being conducted by the Suzzallo Renovation Programming Committee considers the service configuration demanded by this strategic vision. The Task Force recommends two longer term initiatives: construction of a fine arts library to combine the existing Art, Drama and Music Libraries; and, construction of a natural sciences and natural resources library to combine the current Natural Sciences, Fisheries-Oceanography, and Forest Resources Libraries, and, perhaps, the Map Collection. The Task Force recommends that the Libraries seek ongoing opportunities to consolidate physical science collections as well as opportunities to further the realization of the library without walls.

II. Background for the Service Location Evaluation

The mission of the University of Washington Libraries is to improve the educational, research, and service programs of the University through the dissemination of knowledge. The Libraries acquires, manages, and promotes the creation and use of knowledge in an atmosphere where information and ideas are readily accessible and freely exchanged. In carrying out this mission, the Libraries is committed to providing excellent service to a diverse clientele.

While maintaining its traditional role of acquiring and preserving recorded knowledge, the Libraries has developed services to enhance the ability of faculty, students and staff to fully utilize that cumulative record. Information services to the campus have grown in complexity over the past decade, most recently with the provision of networked information. Interdisciplinary pursuits have multiplied and new disciplines have emerged. Educational communities have become more diverse in their backgrounds, interests, and methods of research. The University has become more sophisticated in response to social and technological changes, and new organizational models are evolving. Within this environment of change and shifting expectations, the Libraries remains committed to providing quality service to the individual library user. However, several factors demand that the Libraries review how to sustain quality service while responding to advances in information technology, dramatic shifts in scholarly communication, and increasingly interdisciplinary nature of the campus research and teaching, all in an environment of diminishing budgetary resources.

The Libraries underwent a period of significant decentralization from the mid-1940s through the early 1960s. The reasons for service and collection decentralization varied, including facility inadequacies, the rapid growth in post-war enrollments and the significant increase in information resources at that time. The completion of the Suzzallo Library addition in the early 1960s and the Odegaard Undergraduate Library in the early 1970s effectively ended the addition of new service and collection locations. Indeed, no new branch libraries have been established since then and some branches actually were consolidated into Suzzallo after the 1960's addition was completed. Today, the University of Washington Libraries system is composed of the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries with collections primarily in the humanities and social sciences; the Odegaard Undergraduate Library (OUGL); the Health Sciences Library and Information Center (HSLIC); the East Asia Library; eighteen specialized branch libraries; and two branch campus libraries, which are located in Bothell and Tacoma. The historical rationale for branch libraries must now be re-examined in light of recent changes in facilities, academic programs, and information technology.

Should the Libraries continue to operate all its current service locations? Can the Libraries afford to operate them? Are there alternative, less costly, and more equitable ways to deliver quality service to the university community? These questions, within the context of the changing environment in which the Libraries operates, prompted this review of service locations.

There are several reasons for evaluating service locations for consolidation. First, the Libraries staffing levels were reduced due to a 5% reduction in the operating budget for the 93/95 biennium and funding of classified staff upgrades. There is the possibility of further reductions resulting from the passage of Initiative 601. Second, the quality of user services is threatened from continuing to stretch reduced staff across a number of service locations. Third, the requirements

II. Background for the Service Location Evaluation (continued)

of interdisciplinary research and teaching far exceed the support offered by narrowly focused subject collections. Finally, information technology, document delivery, and the enhancements possible in a networked information environment provide opportunities for new and better ways, to deliver information and services to the campus community. The Libraries has chosen to examine how it can improve information and library services for the campus during a time of fluctuating funding levels and dynamic change in scholarly communication, information technology, and the interdisciplinary nature of teaching and research.

III. Establishment of the Task Force on Service Location Evaluation

In August 1993, Director of University Libraries Betty Bengtson appointed the Task Force on Service Location Evaluation to examine service locations and evaluate whether consolidating any locations would result in improved user services and/or cost savings (Appendix 1). Thom Deardorff and Kay Denfeld joined the Task Force shortly after the group was appointed. Bengtson stated that the goal of any consolidation would be to enhance services, reduce expenditures and avoid further erosion of service quality. The Task Force was not charged with necessarily recommending consolidation of specific locations but rather with providing information which could be used for decisions on consolidation and subsequent service improvement. The Task Force's work was designated to be primarily a process internal to the Libraries. Subsequent stages will involve the Faculty Council on University Libraries, faculty, campus administration, and other appropriate groups and individuals.

The Task Force's charge can be summarized as follows:

To examine service locations and evaluate whether consolidating any locations would result in improved user services and/or cost savings;
To identify critical or weighted factors to be used in the evaluation and apply them;
To identify costs of current service locations, recurring savings anticipated, costs of providing alternative modes of service, and one-time costs of consolidation;
To consult with individuals knowledgeable about service requirements, space and facilities issues, collection issues, costs, and technical service impacts.

IV. Goal of the Service Location Evaluation

The goal of the service location evaluation was to examine current service locations and evaluate whether consolidating any locations would result in improved user services and/or cost savings. Examples of improved user services include: longer hours of collection and services availability; bringing related collections together in one location; providing a greater array of services; and user access to more and better information technology.

V. Working Assumptions and Agreements

The Task Force's work was guided by several working assumptions and agreements. Some of these agreements were articulated before the work commenced and others emerged as work progressed. These assumptions and agreements play a significant role in shaping the Task Force's final report and recommendations.

1. The Task Force used the *Working Document on Service Location Evaluation* (7/30/93) to guide its work. The document is reproduced as Appendix 2.

2. The Task Force's work was primarily an internal process. The Task Force did not directly consult with users in gathering information or in formulating its recommendations. However, the Task Force did use some data collected previously from library users.

3. The Task Force operated on the principle that specific library related needs of departments, colleges and schools must be balanced with the needs of the larger campus community.

4. The Task Force focused on the current facilities of the Libraries and did not make any assumptions about future building or renovation efforts. The Task Force did not exclude from review libraries which have new facilities planned or under construction.

5. The Task Force divided "service locations" into two types: those in branch libraries (stand-alone) and those within larger facilities. In-depth evaluations were conducted only for stand-alone service locations. Evaluation of service locations within larger facilities (i.e. Suzzallo and Allen, and OUGL) must follow initial work now under way by the Suzzallo Renovation Programming Committee.

6. For programmatic reasons, the Task Force did not consider OUGL as a site in which to consolidate other units.

7. The Task Force did not consider the Odegaard Undergraduate Library, the East Asia Library, the Health Sciences Library and Information Center, or the Social Work Library as candidates for consolidation because there is no appropriate space in which to consolidate them. The Task Force did not consider consolidating the Friday Harbor Library or the K.K. Sherwood Library since they are located off-campus.

VI. Review of Branch Libraries for Consolidation

Development of the Criteria for Service Location Evaluation

To guide the evaluation of the branch libraries, the document *Criteria for Service Location Evaluation* was developed by the Libraries in consultation with the Faculty Council on University Libraries. Criteria were chosen that related directly to the quality of service provided by the Libraries to its diverse clientele. The criteria document addresses broad categories: the number of users, reasons for use, level of use, facilities, collections, location,

Development of the Criteria for Service Location Evaluation (continued)

user access, staffing, security, and viability of service alternatives. The *Criteria for Service Location Evaluation* is available as Appendix 3.

Consolidation Potential

The Task Force agreed that some elements of the criteria were more important than others and should be weighted accordingly. These weighted criteria would then be used to sort service locations for further consideration. While no one factor was judged sufficient to eliminate a unit from consideration, the Task Force identified three criteria that were judged most critical in reviewing consolidation of service units into Suzzallo and Allen Libraries.

- The number of primary users supported by the branch library
  How many people are there in the primary departments supported by the branch library?

- Related collections and services in Suzzallo and Allen Libraries
  Do faculty and graduate students in the primary departments supported by the branch library also make use of Suzzallo and Allen collections?

- Distance between the branch library and Suzzallo and Allen Libraries
  How far is it from the branch library to the most appropriate entrance to the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries?

Initial Application

The Task Force collected data on these criteria for each branch library and also provided potential for consolidation ranking (ranging from 0 to 3) for each one. The Task Force then reviewed the overall pattern, and next applied a cumulative weighting and ranking which eliminated some units from further consideration.

a. ***What is the number of primary users (faculty, graduate students, undergraduates) served by the service location?***

The Task Force identified the primary users of each service unit as defined by the schools, colleges, and/or departments specifically served. Undergraduate and graduate student numbers were taken from the 1992-93 enrollment figures compiled by the Office of the Registrar. The number of faculty and research associates were drawn from the *1993 University of Washington Faculty/Staff Directory*. Affiliate and adjunct faculty were not included in the faculty count. Results are arranged from units with smallest faculty/graduate student populations to those with the largest constituency.

PRIMARY USER POPULATION

UNIT	FACULTY	GRAD	TOTAL	RANK	UNDERGRADS
Philosophy	13	42	55	3	119
Geography	14	72	86		243
Drama	17	79	96		195
Poli Science	27	86	113		774
Art	43	128	171		1013
Forest Res	53	209	262	2	221
Music	49	238	287		170
Math	90	197	287		278
Physics-Astro	109	223	332		218
Architecture	87	322	401	1	363
Chemistry	168	253	421		579
Fish-Ocean	113	323	436		205
Bus Ad	140	508	648	0	1939
Engineering	254	1210	1464		2092

Faculty and graduate student numbers were separated from those of undergraduate majors. The former group is tied directly to the departmental location where offices and workspaces are located, while undergraduate majors, in general, take more courses outside the department and make much more extensive use of the Odegaard Undergraduate Library and the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries.

b. ***What is the departmental use of the Suzzallo and Allen collections?***

Results from the Spring 1992 faculty and graduate student surveys were used to determine the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries use by faculty and graduate students who compose the primary user group of the branch library. The survey respondents marked the units they used and the frequency which they used them (weekly, monthly, quarterly). The Task Force weighted frequency of use for a particular unit by allocating 10 points for weekly use, 3 points for monthly use, and 1 point for quarterly use. For Suzzallo and Allen Libraries, separate scores were compiled for distinct collections (e.g., Government Publications, Natural Sciences Library, Microforms and Newspapers, etc.) and used as part of the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries total. These were combined with the highest individual score for those units making up the "main collection" (e.g., Circulation, Information Desk, Periodicals, Reference). These weighted totals were then added to show the proportion of use for the primary branch and for Suzzallo and Allen Libraries units. Appendix 4 on the College of Forest Resources use of library units illustrates how totals were achieved.

The results show the proportion of Suzzallo and Allen Libraries use compared to use of the branch library by the primary user group for each unit. The higher the score, the greater the use of Suzzallo and Allen Libraries. For example, a percentage score of 54 for Political Science faculty shows that faculty used Suzzallo and Allen Libraries units more

b. What is the departmental use of the Suzzallo and Allen collections? (continued)

extensively for their information needs (54%) than the Political Science Library (46%) Results are arranged in order of higher Suzzallo and Allen Libraries use by either faculty or graduate students.

SUZZALLO AND ALLEN LIBRARIES USE BY BRANCH LIBRARY PRIMARY USERS

UNIT	FACULTY	GRADUATE STUDENTS	RANK
Poli Science	54%	62%	3
Geography	56	56	
Forest Res.	36	52	
Fish-Ocean	24	38	2
Art	35	34	
Architecture	34	33	
Music	32	31	
Engineering	23	29	1
Physics-Asto	29	11	
Bus Ad	21	27	
Philosophy	27	0	
Chemistry	25	11	
Drama	23	12	
Math	17	7	0

Survey results provided a good indicator of departmental use of units within the Libraries. However, in some cases, although still useful, the sample sizes are too small to be statistically valid.

c. How close would such a consolidated service location be to the current location and the department(s) served?

Using an approximate "as the crow flies" distance measure from the current location to the closest, most appropriate entrance to the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries complex, the Task Force determined the proximity to the consolidated location in linear feet. The Task Force noted that physical distance may be complicated by the route (uphill, around construction, across a major arterial). Units are arranged in order of increasing distance from the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries.

UNIT	DISTANCE FROM SUZZALLO & ALLEN IN LINEAR FEET	RANK
Poli Science	225	3
Geography	250	
Philosophy	375	
Engineering	750	2
Music	750	
Art	825	
Chemistry	900	
Math	900	
Architecture	1125	1
Bus Ad	1200	
Physics-Astro	1350	
Drama	1350	
Forest Res	1500	
Fish-Ocean	2400	0

Consolidation Potential Ranking

There are natural breaks in each of these sort categories. Using a ranking system of 0 to 3 with 3 representing the strongest potential for consolidation, the Task Force developed two total weighted scores for each unit. One total included the weighting for undergraduates and the other excluded the undergraduate score. The Task Force was undecided whether a larger number of undergraduates did or did not suggest consolidation. However, the inclusion of undergraduate students did not affect the overall ranking of units.

Consolidation Potential

Unit	Fac/Grad	Suzz/Allen	Distance	Total	Undergrads	Total
Geography	3	3	3	9	2	11
Poli Science	3	3	3	9	1	10
Philosophy	3	1	3	7	3	10
Art	3	2	2	7	1	8
Music	2	2	2	6	3	9
Forest Res.	2	3	1	6	2	8
Drama	3	1	1	5	3	8
Physics-Astro	2	1	1	4	2	6
Architecture	1	2	1	4	2	6
Math	2	0	2	4	2	6
Fish-Ocean	1	2	0	3	2	5
Chemistry	1	1	2	4	1	5
Engineering	0	1	2	3	0	3
Bus Ad	0	1	1	2	0	2

Consolidation Potential Ranking (continued)

After analyzing these results, the Task Force determined that all units with a score below 5 (without undergraduates) or 8 (with undergraduates) would be eliminated from consideration. The combination of primary user community size, distance, and lower reliance on Suzzallo and Allen Libraries, worked to separate these from the other units. The Task Force concentrated further analysis on Art, Drama, Forest Resources, Geography, Music, Philosophy, and Political Science.

Application of Full Criteria

In this stage of the evaluation, the objective of the Task Force was to apply all fifty-five criteria listed in the *Criteria for Service Location Evaluation* to the seven branch libraries. In addition to the original fifty-five criteria, three more were added for a total of fifty-eight: percent shelving occupied in linear feet, linear feet of collection; and, hours of opening to be gained by consolidation into Suzzallo and Allen Libraries.

The table of criteria was divided into two groups, those which referred to quantitative elements such as number of primary user departments (21 criteria), and those which could best be discussed in descriptive form (37 criteria). Spreadsheets were prepared covering the quantitative information. Other criteria became the basis for documents entitled *Interview Topics*. There is an *Interview Topics* document for each of the seven branch libraries. Any information among these criteria for which there were no readily available information sources became part of the *Unit Interview* script.

After compiling all of the available information into the data spreadsheets or the *Interview Topics*, the Task Force assigned members to two-person teams which interviewed each of the seven unit heads from the Art, Drama, Music, Forest Resources, Geography, Philosophy, and Political Science libraries. In the interviews, the unit heads supplied missing information for the *Interview Topics* and responded to a number of questions which had been sent ahead of time to the interviewees. The interview scripts, the *Interview Topics*, and the detailed notes of the interviews are attached as Appendix 5.

VII. What Would be Gained Through Consolidation?

The Task Force in consultation with branch librarians identified service enhancements and financial cost savings which could be achieved through consolidation.

Service Enhancements

Consolidation of branch libraries would provide enhancements in hours of access, facilities, service, collections, and staff.

Hours of access
Consolidation of branch libraries into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries would result in significantly longer hours of user access to collections, services, and staff than is currently afforded. Longer hours was identified on the 1992 surveys as a user priority.

Service Enhancements

Hours of access (continued)
The Suzzallo and Allen Libraries are open 108.5 hours weekly during regular terms. Access to the collections of each of the seven units would be increased as follows if consolidated:

Library	Number of hours of access gained
Philosophy	63.5
Geography	59.5
Drama	58.5
Forest Resources	43.5
Music	43.5
Political Science	39.5
Art	39.5

Facilities
Consolidation would result in: 1) improved security of collections, equipment, staff, and users; 2) adjacency to a copy center and more plentiful self-service copiers, the Suzzallo Computing Resources Center, and the Allen Auditorium; 3) improved environmental conditions for collections, staff, and users; 4) better lighting, sound and heating control; 5) improved work space, and additional shelving; 6) greater flexibility in space; and 7) improved access for individuals with disabilities.

According to the Washington state guidelines for evaluation of library facilities in the four year higher education institutions (*The Facilities Evaluation and Planning Guide Library Study Facilities)*, all units ran a deficit in at least one of the three categories (collections, user seating, or staff and user assistance space). Five of the seven libraries have significant space deficits overall.

Library	Square Foot Deficit
Art	5,020
Political Science	4,438
Music	1,898
Drama	780
Geography	545

Consolidation would ameliorate some of the Libraries' most severe space problems.

Service
Consolidation would realize gains in service to both the primary department and other constituencies. Users would have expanded access to CD-ROM services, instructional programs, a full array of equipment, comprehensive reference and research services, and weekend and evening service.

Service Enhancements (continued)

Collections

Users would find easier access to a broad range of related collections as well as resources in other formats such as CD-ROM, electronic files, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), microforms, maps, and government publications through consolidation. Funds now spent on material duplication could be spent to enrich the collection. Consolidation would bring like collections together supporting and facilitating interdisciplinary research and teaching.

Data on the use of the unit by faculty and graduate students outside of the primary department(s) from the 1992 surveys shows that there is heavy interdisciplinary use in several of the branches. The following chart illustrates the proportion of unit use by primary faculty compared to the total number of faculty users. For example, of the total number of faculty users of the Political Science Library, 70% of them are from outside the primary department. Interdisciplinary use of these collections would be facilitated through consolidation.

Interdisciplinary Faculty Use

Unit	Primary	Non-Primary	Total	% Non-Primary
Poli Sci	99	232	331	(70%)
Phil	63	81	144	(56%)
Geog	60	56	116	(48%)
Art	103	67	170	(39%)
Music	73	45	118	(38%)
For Res	101	44	145	(30%)
Drama	93	37	130	(28%)

Staff

Consolidation would allow for increased flexibility in the provision of service during staff leaves and increased opportunities for collegial interchange and ongoing job enrichment. Consolidation would also facilitate staff consultation with one another. Consequently staff would call on their colleague's expertise and service would be enhanced.

Financial Cost Savings

What costs would be saved through consolidation? In order to determine savings that would be achieved through consolidation, it is helpful to first look at what the annual costs are for each unit.

Financial Cost Savings

Current Costs

As the Libraries does not operate its units as cost centers and the Libraries is an integrated system with services and collections not neatly segmented by location, it is impossible to present a precise accounting of the costs to operate a service location. The Task Force gathered the cost figures readily available for each of the seven libraries. The *Current Annual Costs* chart below details the costs the Task Force was able to identify.

Current Annual Costs
Fiscal Year 1994

	Personnel (1)			Library Resources*(2)*			Printer		
Unit	Staff	Hourly	**Total**	Mono	Serials	**Total**	Supplies*(3)*	Phones*(4)*	**TOTAL**
ART	89508	10310	99818	59914	27850	87764	3150	223	190,955
DRAMA	55167	7300	62467	16580	5135	21715	2450	366	86,998
FOR. RES.	79008	7480	86488	16231	68311	84542	3150	717	174,897
GEOG	45228	4835	50063	8994	20002	28996	1750	242	81,051
MUSIC	136248	19040	155288	41659	28674	70333	4200	800	230,621
PHILOS	31212	6805	38017	16915	26026	42941	2100	227	83,285
POL. SCI.	85956	10355	96311	43471	55531	99002	2800	425	198,538
TOTAL	522327	66125	588452	203764	231529	435293	19600	3000	$1,046,345

(1) Personnel costs (librarian, classified staff, and hourly salaries) are FY94 figures The salary of the Head, Humanities/Social Sciences Libraries is not included as a part of the cost of the Music Library. Personnel costs do not include benefits.

(2) The *Library Resources* costs are taken from the January 4, 1994 fund group report. Monographic costs represent the total allocation for monographs and approval plans for the discipline the branch serves. Serials costs represent the combined continuations and serial renewal allocation for the discipline the branch serves. Fine arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences general funds were not included in these totals.

(3) Supply costs are not tracked on a unit level. The Task Force suggests that the *Printer Supplies* give some indication of relative operational costs. It is estimated that the annual cost for supplies and maintenance for a computer printer in the Libraries runs between $350 and $600 depending on level of use and type of printer. The printer supplies column signifies the annual supplies and maintenance costs for the total number of printers in a given unit at $350 per machine.

(4) The *Phones* figure represents line, instrument, and option charges. Long distance and toll charges are not included because the information is not readily available on a unit level.

Financial Cost Savings (continued)

Cost Savings

What would be saved if service locations were consolidated? In answering this question, the Task Force made the following assumptions:

- The Libraries would continue to collect materials for and serve the disciplines currently addressed by the branch; and
- Librarians and classified staff in the branches would be reassigned to other locations.

Working with these assumptions, the Task Force estimated the cost savings in several categories.

Personnel

The Task Force suggests that consolidated staff be moved either to units which assume responsibility for the branch's service and collection workload, to positions canceled due to budget reductions, or to vacant positions. Through consolidation, there should be some diminution of workload related to facilities and collection management. Consolidation would allow the Libraries to consider requests for 9 month appointments; this is not possible in the current branch environment. The Task Force anticipates both immediate savings depending on the status of vacant positions at the time of consolidation and longer term savings based on shifts in workload.

There would also be some savings in the hourly budget. Some work currently done by students in the branches would still be necessary in the consolidated location. For instance, consolidating a collection of 50,000 volumes into Suzzallo and Allen Libraries would require increased student hours to support circulation and collection maintenance activities. Likewise, moving branch reserve functions to OUGL would have a concomitant impact on its need for hourly assistance. However, some of the branch hourly budget is tied to keeping the doors open. The Task Force estimates that half of the hourly budget for each consolidated unit would be saved and the other half redistributed to units absorbing the service load.

Library Materials

The Task Force reviewed possible savings in library materials resulting from consolidation. Over the past decade, the Collection Development Program policies and inadequate funding for monograph acquisitions have worked to discourage duplication. There is some limited duplication for programmatic reasons. The need to duplicate titles varies from discipline to discipline. For example, there is more duplication of political science materials among the Political Science Library, OUGL, and the Suzzallo Library because of the nature of the undergraduate curriculum and research in political science. On the other hand, there is less duplication of art monographs. It is unclear if consolidation would alter the programmatic need for duplication. The Task Force feels there would be modest savings in the monographic budget.

Financial Cost Savings

Cost Savings

Library Materials (continued)

Likewise, there is minimal duplication of serial titles. Most duplicate subscriptions have been canceled over the past decade. Some titles, particularly reference materials, could be canceled as a result of consolidation. These titles would need to be reviewed on a title by title basis. To illustrate this, Task Force member Alvin Fritz reviewed the duplicate political science titles and identified $1,552 in subscriptions he would recommend canceling if the Political Science Library were consolidated. Many of the titles are reference sets. A title by title analysis is presented in Appendix 6.

Equipment

Equipment purchases for the Libraries units are made in response to specific service and collection needs. Equipment needs change from year to year. Consequently, it is impossible to pinpoint potential annual cost savings in equipment. There would, however, be considerable one-time savings in systems equipment. The systems equipment purchased during FY93 for consolidated units could be used to fulfill outstanding equipment needs in other units.

Supplies / General Operating Costs

There would be a small reduction in supply and general operating costs through consolidation. Savings would result from reduced need for such items as unit guides, photocopying, mail delivery, and computer printing.

Telecommunications

Some telecommunication costs would be saved through consolidation, although it is difficult to estimate exactly what that savings would be. The total annual line, instrument and option charges for the seven units is $3,000. If units were consolidated, some lines, but not all, would be required for reassigned staff and functions.

Security Systems

The Libraries would save the costs of installing book security systems in the Political Science, Geography, Philosophy, Music, Drama and Forest Resources Libraries if the collections were consolidated. The Art Library currently has a security system in place. The costs for a security gate system, attendant desensitizing equipment, and physical plant work would range from approximately $7,000 to $25,000 per branch. In the past, these costs have been shared by departments and the Libraries. The cost of stripping the collections would be incurred whether or not the unit was consolidated.

One Time Costs of Consolidation

The Task Force identified the one time costs of consolidating units. These costs are detailed in the chart reproduced as Appendix 7. Consolidation costs would be incurred to shift, load, transport, count, unload and shelve books and serials. In addition, processing costs would be involved in security stripping and remarking items as well as changing online and binding records. The Suzzallo and Allen Libraries and Natural Sciences Library (NSL) collections would have to be shifted to accommodate the consolidated units regardless if one or all seven branches were consolidated. For instance, it would cost $7,648 to move the Political Science Library into Suzzallo and Allen Libraries in addition to $21,113 needed to shift the Main and Periodicals collections. If the Forest Resources Library were consolidated into NSL $11,294 ($8,102 to move materials to NSL and $3,192 to shift collections already in NSL) would be needed. The Task Force noted that some of these costs could be covered through reallocating current unit staff to this initiative.

VIII. What Would be Lost Through Consolidation?

Branch libraries are known for customized services, convenience for and proximity to users, and the integral role they play in the life of the department(s) served. During the unit interviews, branch staff identified areas that needed particular consideration in the event of consolidation.

Customized Services

Branch librarians noted that branches make it easier for library staff to achieve an in-depth knowledge of users needs. Classified staff have the opportunity to develop expert knowledge of the collection through processing and circulating materials. With this knowledge, staff are able to readily customize and personalize reader services and anticipate requests. The collections and service locations of most branch libraries are within the same sight lines. Staff are able to leave the desk to provide customized reference from the stacks.

Branch reserve service is noted for its responsiveness. Reserve readings are frequently changed and prompt turnaround and processing is the norm. Books on reserve are kept in context to other materials that contain like or related materials. This is particularly important in the Art Library where visual images and supporting documentation are essential. Branch librarians questioned whether or not such responsive, integrated, and flexible reserve services could be maintained in a consolidated location.

Convenience and Proximity

The branch location is usually quite convenient for the primary user group. The location of the branch allows for the easy transport of special and fragile library materials (art books, recordings, and compact discs, plays and acting editions) to classroom and departmental offices.

Convenience and Proximity (continued)

The branch's proximity to primary clientele enhances ongoing, two-way communication between the library staff and its clientele. Library staff encounter users in the library, the hallways, the building lounge, and other school, college and departmental locations. Library staff have convenient access to the services and expertise of the unit being served. The Music Listening Center, for example, uses the dubbing and sound enhancement equipment located in and owned by the School of Music. The Listening Center's sound equipment is serviced by the School of Music's media technician.

Being close to the primary clientele affords other advantages for branch libraries. The Art Library, for example, serves as a setting for displays and installations of faculty and student art work. The Drama Department houses special in-house collections such as the costume patterns and lighting gels in the Drama Library. These departments might opt to maintain their own special collections and exhibits if the branch library were no longer so convenient.

Integral Role of the Library

The trade-off between localization and consolidation which the unit heads mentioned most frequently in their interviews is between a library staff integrated and frequently engaged with the department, school, or college on one hand, and, on the other, increased access to collection, other information resources, and service facilities and greater security for collections, staff, and users. Several of the unit heads felt that if there were a consolidation of their unit or another branch, it would be necessary to rethink the role of the selector and primary information provider for the disciplines formerly served by the branch. The new role definition would necessarily include a requirement for an aggressive outreach program which would take the librarian to the department on a frequent basis.

IX. Alternative Service Delivery Options and Costs of Implementation

The branch model is distinguished by convenient, responsive, flexible, customized, and integrated services. Are there ways to maintain these desirable attributes of branch libraries in a consolidated model? The Task Force identified a wide range of alternative ways to replicate and enhance library service now delivered by the branches. The options listed below are placed in two categories: services delivered to primary departments and services offered in central library facilities (Suzzallo and Allen Libraries, and OUGL) to all library users. These alternative service enhancements are independent of consolidation of libraries, but consolidations would expedite their implementation. Determining exact costs for providing alternative service options is dependent on several variables, some known, others not. These variables range from the number of *electronic library* installations to the cost of specific CD-ROM products to the degree of difficulty incurred in wiring sections of Suzzallo. The Task Force has gathered detailed cost figures which are available in its files.

Primary Departments

Space:

a. **Utilize space within the department for computer workstations with access to library information resources. The workstation, or *electronic library*, could be located in the old library space or elsewhere in the department, preferably within an existing computer lab for security and maintenance reasons.**

To provide a computer workstation or *electronic library* in the consolidated library space or elsewhere in the department, costs may be incurred for wiring, equipment, maintenance, support, and supplies.

Existing Ethernet connections and workstations could be left in place in the consolidated units. However, some equipment upgrades may be required.

b. **Provide study space for students if none is available elsewhere in the building. This could be located in the same space as the *electronic library*.**

The decision to use vacated library for study space would be within the purview of the University. Likewise, the costs of remodeling or retrofitting the space would be outside of the Libraries' responsibility.

c. **Provide space/office for an *outreach* librarian to use for scheduled office hours, appointments, and consultations.**

There would not be additional costs incurred in providing an outreach librarian to the department(s). This outreach librarian would be the former branch librarian. There may be some equipment and furniture expenses incurred in setting up an office.

Central Library Services

1. **Remote Self-Service Circulation: enable users to request, renew, and recall materials remotely.**

Costs associated with conducting circulation remotely through e-mail or phone would be primarily personnel costs. These costs could be covered through redeployment of staff associated with the consolidation of branches. The more desirable approach is to allow users to interact directly with the online circulation record and place their own holds, renewals, and requests. Outside of the initial programming costs, these options would actually save staff costs through the transfer of circulation operations to the users.

Central Library Services (continued)

2. **Document Delivery: provide document delivery (book and journal articles) to departmental offices.**

   Based on the experiences of Resource Sharing Services in providing the branch campuses with book delivery, the Task Force estimates that delivery of materials to departmental offices would cost the Libraries $4.00 - $5.00 per request. Based on Library Express' experience, journal articles can be delivered at $5.00 per article. The costs of offering such a service would depend on the scope and popularity of the option.

3. **Reserve Liaison: provide a reserve technician liaison during the first year after consolidation to facilitate transfer of reserve operations to OUGL.**

   The Task Force suggests that a reserve technician liaison would be provided by consolidated staff; no additional expense would be incurred.

4. **Direct Line: provide a telephone hot line dedicated to the primary clientele of consolidated branches.**

   A telephone hot line dedicated to the primary clientele of consolidated branches would cost approximately $200 a year (monthly $15.21 basic fee and a $1.25 call forwarding charge). However, this cost might be covered by lines no longer necessary due to consolidation.

5. **Stack Maintenance: enhance stack maintenance in Suzzallo and Allen Libraries to ensure fast turnaround time for reshelving of materials.**

   Enhanced stack maintenance would expedite getting material (monographs & periodicals) back on the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries shelves . An additional 20 hours per week of Student I ($4.90 an hour) would cost $5,096 annually. Funding for this increased staffing could come from hourly funds previously allocated to consolidated units.

6. **Networked Faculty and Graduate Studies: set aside a number of Suzzallo and Allen Libraries faculty study rooms and graduate student carrels with network access for use by departments affected by consolidation. This special arrangement would be a temporary, transitional measure.**

   Providing network access to faculty and graduate studies in the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries would require conduit and Ethernet in Suzzallo and activating Ethernet connections in Allen. The Suzzallo Renovation Programming Committee has begun to address providing network access to these studies.

Central Library Services (continued)

7. **Information Access, Knowledge Management Consultation, and Network Connection Services.**

   Information access, knowledge management consultation, and network connection services would be provided by the existing staff, so no additional personnel costs would be involved. Since such services go beyond the traditional reference services of identifying and retrieving information to an expanded role of evaluating and managing, staff development and training costs may be incurred for librarians who need training to provide these new and expanded services.

8. **Remote Access to Library Databases: provide remote access to library databases and other electronic resources formerly located in the branch library. Expand remote access to related products currently located in Suzzallo and Allen Libraries.**

   Providing remote access to CD-ROM resources formerly located in a consolidated branch would require a local network. In addition to hardware and support costs, the Libraries would incur network fees for each database. These licensing fees vary by vendor, with the pricing continuum ranging from no additional charge (H.W. Wilson) to a 100% surcharge. Access to such services as OCLC's FirstSearch may ameliorate the need for some CD-ROM networking.

9. **Current Awareness Services: offer table of contents access to primary journals. Combine this service with SDI (Selective Dissemination of Information) for tailored subsets of identified journals. Offer tailored acquisitions list.**

   Plans are already underway for a table of contents services through the tape loading of OCLC's Serial Table of Contents (STOC). Customized SDI services are possible now through the Zephyr prototype and through interface enhancements in the future. A customized acquisitions list can also be produced using Zephyr and then distributed electronically or through print. No hardware or programming costs would be incurred in providing these services through Zephyr.

X. Review of Internal Service Locations

The Task Force did not conduct a comprehensive review of internal service locations in Suzzallo and Allen Libraries since the Suzzallo Renovation Programming Committee will be completing a review within the first six months of 1994 in preparation for a major renovation. Likewise the Task Force did not intensively review internal service locations in the Odegaard Undergraduate Library (OUGL). Paula Walker, Director of OUGL, has already begun guiding the OUGL staff in reconfiguring its service locations. The Task Force did, however, have an informal discussion with some of the unit heads from Suzzallo and Allen Libraries and from the Odegaard

X. Review of Internal Service Locations (continued)

Undergraduate Library. A summary of that discussion along with background documents from the Reference and Research Services Division and the Odegaard Undergraduate Library are included with the minutes of the Task Force.

While the renovation of the Suzzallo Library will most likely focus on such infrastructure problems as the heating and ventilating system, fire and life safety systems, seismic stability, power and telecommunications capability, and elevator replacement, the pre-design planning process will consider needed program-related changes and will prioritize them. Members of the pre-design planning committee anticipate that when the Library undergoes renovations for infrastructure upgrading, opportunities will present themselves for moving functional areas and improving the overall organization of the building. An important objective will be to consider the service patterns within the building and to recommend needed improvements. It will be critical in the review process to assure, in so far as it is possible, that service considerations shape the space rather than allowing the space to dictate the service programs.

XI. Considerations and Recommendations

When the Task Force began working, its initial focus was on evaluating discrete service locations. Early on it became apparent that any review of service units needed to be conducted within a larger context. How should the Libraries be configured to provide quality user services within the context of the evolving electronic library, significant shifts in scholarly communication, the increasing interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching, and the reality of available resources? The Task Force recommends that the Libraries proactively shape the library of the future rather than react in a piecemeal fashion to these changes. The Libraries should sculpt a future in which it can maintain and expand quality service rather than settle for a future that is defined and curtailed by the current configuration of service locations.

The current configuration of branch libraries represents a relatively inflexible infrastructure that often does not meet the service needs of users. Branches that are narrowly focused are anachronistic vestiges of a time when disciplines were more self-contained and libraries were solely print-based. Electronic distribution of many services and resources to the desktop in the office, residence hall room, and the home begins to replicate some of the convenience, ease of use, and proximity that were the raison d'être of branches. The current configuration is expensive to maintain, constraining, and rooted in a model that is increasingly outmoded. The Task Force recommends that the Libraries strategically move in the direction of a library system predicated on fewer, more consolidated physical locations that takes advantage of a network infrastructure and electronic information systems to customize and deliver information and services directly to the desktop while still recognizing the value of the library as place.

In order to achieve this vision, the Task Force recommends that the Libraries take steps toward the strategic clustering of collections and services by disciplines, expanding the library without walls, and ensuring quality services for the Libraries' diverse users. Clustering of libraries brings together related information sources and provides for staffing and equipment needed for a full array of services. In the library without walls, increasing emphasis is placed on providing services

XI. Considerations and Recommendations (continued)

that are not limited by the hours the library is open or by its physical location (e.g., remote access to databases, document delivery, full text, etc.). Ensuring quality user services necessitates an integrated, system-wide user services philosophy and program.

Specific Recommendations

Achieving this vision will be a lengthy process, requiring extensive consultation with the campus community and major long-term capital initiatives. The Task Force recommends that the Libraries take the following short range, longer range, and ongoing steps toward building a library that is better positioned to provide quality user services in an environment characterized by dynamic change in information technology, patterns of scholarly communication, the interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching, and funding.

Short Range (within one year)

Consolidate the Geography, Philosophy, and Political Science Libraries into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries. There is space available in Suzzallo and Allen Libraries for some but not all of the seven units. These three consolidations would result in all humanities and social sciences disciplines that are part of the College of Arts and Sciences being focused in the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries. The Task Force does not recommend consolidating the Art, Drama, Forest Resources, or Music Libraries into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries.

Institute a document (books and journal articles) delivery service. The Libraries has been successful in expanding remote access to bibliographic data but not to the content ("we've sent the menus, but not the meals"). Document delivery is a corner stone of bringing the Libraries to the desk top and demonstrating that the Libraries can provide service regardless of location.

Offer remote self-service circulation. The Libraries has begun working to allow individuals to request, recall, and renew materials identified through UWLIB. This effort should receive additional attention if the Libraries is to realize the goal of a library without walls.

Identify ways to expedite the acquisition, processing and shelving of monographs and serials. It is generally perceived that the branch libraries are more responsive than Suzzallo and Allen Libraries in expediting searches for missing items, claims and following up on problems. Ways should be actively sought to make these services more timely and user-centered.

Articulate a Libraries-wide service philosophy. In order to ensure that quality service is being offered equitably throughout the Libraries, and users are not being disadvantaged or advantaged by the size or location of the libraries they frequent, the Libraries should develop a libraries-wide service philosophy and a user "bill of rights." The Public Services Administrative Group subgroup on service levels has begun preliminary work in this area.

Specific Recommendations

Short Range (within one year) (continued)

Examine and redefine the role of librarians in the context of this strategic direction. In a library where service is not place-bound and where maintaining responsive services made easier in the branches is desired, librarians committed to bringing "the library to the desktop" both through electronic and traditional means will be vital to quality service. Liaison, outreach, knowledge management instruction, and partnering endeavors will take on added importance. Some librarians are already operating in this model; others will need support and direction in order to take up this role.

Develop an integrated program statement for the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries. Developing such a statement may entail a service review of the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries beyond the scope of the Suzzallo Renovation Programming Committee.

Develop an integrated program statement for the Odegaard Undergraduate Library which builds on OUGL as a gateway for undergraduates to the library system. Expand the foundation OUGL has built in user education, undergraduate education, emerging technologies, and experimentation and innovation.

Ensure that the pre-planning program review being conducted by the Suzzallo Renovation Programming Committee considers the service configurations demanded by this strategic vision.

Longer Range

Construct a fine arts library for a state-of-the-art multimedia, collection, study, education, and research facility to combine the existing Art, Drama, and Music Libraries. These libraries are three of the most over-crowded facilities in the system. Overcrowding will not be addressed by the renovation planned for the three buildings which house these libraries. In fact, the space problems will be exacerbated by ADA provisions required in the renovation. The construction of a fine arts cluster library would allow enhanced services through longer hours of access, expanded instructional and research services, and support of multimedia technologies. Because of the renovation schedule for these three building and the service enhancements possible in a clustered location, construction of a fine arts library should be pursued.

Construct a natural sciences and natural resources library to combine the current Natural Sciences, Fisheries-Oceanography, and Forest Resources Libraries, and perhaps, the Map Collection on the southwest campus. The growth of interdisciplinary science research and teaching combined with the geographic centralization of the life science and natural resources departments argues for locating a natural sciences and natural resources library in the southwest part of the campus. Space released by the Natural Sciences Library could be used for humanities and social sciences growth.

Specific Recommendations

Ongoing

Seek opportunities to consolidate physical science collections. Such consolidations could be achieved through bringing collections and services together in expanded, vacated or new space which would be located in proximity to primary user groups.

Seek opportunities to further the realization of the library without walls.

Consolidations Concerns and Strategies

Given the strategic direction of emphasizing the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries as the primary humanities and social sciences service location, the clientele of the Geography, Philosophy, and Political Science Libraries have the most to gain through consolidation. These consolidations are key to moving the Libraries toward a more responsive and flexible library system.

Based on the intensive review the Task Force conducted of the seven branch libraries, the Task Force agrees that there is much to be gained by the consolidation of these three libraries. There are, of course, drawbacks to consolidation. The Task Force feels that the service enhancements and resource and organizational flexibility resulting from these consolidations are greater than the disadvantages. Earlier in this report, the Task Force presented ideas for alternative service delivery which help to maintain and enhance the hallmarks of excellent branch service.

One-time Costs of Consolidations

The cost of moving and integrating these three collections into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries is estimated to be $33,442. This figure represents $21,113 for shifting the main and periodicals collections to accommodate the three branch collections. Political Science would cost $7,648, Geography $2,055, and Philosophy $2,626 to move. These costs are detailed in Appendix 7. However, there would be future savings as material would no longer need to be routinely relocated from these branches to the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries or Auxiliary Stacks.

Concerns and Strategies

The recommendation to consolidate these three libraries is not a new one. As recently as 1989, the College of Arts and Sciences proposed that these three libraries be closed and moved into the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries, and the vacated space reclaimed for college functions. That initiative failed, but the experience should inform any future plans.

Few topics raise as many highly charged responses as the suggestion to close libraries. Should the Libraries choose to consolidate branch libraries, there will no doubt be some strong resistance to the effort. Based on the discussions with branch librarians, the 1989

Consolidations Concerns and Strategies

Concerns and Strategies (continued)

experience, and advice provided from librarians on other campuses where library consolidations have been initiated, the Task Force offers the following considerations

- If it is decided to consolidate libraries, the Libraries should make every effort to ensure that the consolidation takes place. The 1989 experience was disruptive to branch staff, users, and the rest of the Libraries. The Libraries should avoid a repeat of the 1989 experience.

- For those few departments which have them, branch libraries are a core element of their identity. Branch libraries tend to be symbolic of departmental autonomy. Departments use their branch libraries as faculty and graduate student recruiting tools. Any consolidation process must acknowledge the symbolic value of branch libraries.

- Consolidation of these three branches may serve as a rallying cry for other departments. Some faculty may charge "if they can do it to Political Science, they will do it to my library next." It is important that the Libraries share with the university community its vision for the future of library services and what place future consolidations will have.

- Consolidations must be presented in the context of enhanced services and future directions, as well as resource realities. The Libraries must demonstrate that it can deliver effective service independent of physical space or location.

- Each library recommended for consolidation has its own political environment. The Task Force suggests that ideas identified as alternative service delivery options could be packaged in customized ways to make consolidation more palatable to specific clientele.

- The Libraries should seek the opportunity to recommend uses of the vacated space that will benefit the department most directly affected by consolidation.

- Regardless of whether or not they support the consolidation, departments will feel a sense of loss if their library is consolidated. Acknowledging, and not minimizing, this loss will be important.

- If undertaken, these consolidations may represent an important change in career directions for branch staff. They will have needs for support and understanding and these needs must be met in a humane and timely fashion.

- Some faculty and many graduate students are supportive of the consolidation of these units. The Libraries would do well to engage them in the process.

Consolidations Concerns and Strategies

Concerns and Strategies (continued)

- The branch heads will play a pivotal role in managing the consolidation process. The Libraries should seek their expertise, insights, and assistance.

Implementation of the Recommendations

The Task Force has compiled an extensive archive of minutes, data, notes, and cost figures, and would be pleased to make relevant materials available to individuals involved in the implementation of these recommendations. Additionally, Task Force members are interested in furthering the recommendations, and can offer future assistance both individually and as a group.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

INTERDEPARTMENTAL

APPENDIX 1

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
Office of the Director

August 4, 1993

TO: Al Fritz
Steve Hiller
Margaret Hinshaw
Sarah Michalak
Glenda Pearson
Betsy Wilson
David Wood

FROM: Betty G. Bengtson
Director of University Libraries

SUBJECT: Task Force on Service Location Evaluation

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Task Force on Service Location Evaluation. Betsy Wilson will serve as chair.

The charge to the Task Force is to examine service locations and to evaluate whether consolidating any locations would result in improved user services and/or cost savings. The goal of any consolidation would be to enhance services, reduce expenditures and to avoid further erosion of service quality. The Task Force is to not necessarily recommend consolidating specific locations but rather is to provide information which can be used for decisions on consolidation.

The Task Force should take as its starting point the "Working Document on Service Location Evaluation" which is attached to this memo. Also attached is a copy of "Criteria for Service Location Evaluation" (draft 5/25/93) which is referenced in the "Working Document".

The Task Force should identify critical or weighted factors to be used in the evaluation and apply them to the Libraries' service locations. The evaluation should identify costs of current service locations, recurring savings anticipated through consolidation, costs of providing alternative modes of service, and one-time costs of consolidations.

The Task Force is to consult with individuals knowledgeable about service requirements, space and facilities issues, collection issues, costs, and technical services impacts. Library staff are to be involved to the extent necessary for the Task Force to accomplish its work. This stage of service location evaluation is to be primarily an internal process. Subsequent stages will involve the Faculty Council on University Libraries, faculty, campus administration and other appropriate groups.

A final report summarizing the results of the evaluation is due to me by November 30, 1993.

Betsy Wilson will be in touch with you about the initial meeting of the Task Force.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

BGB:mas
cc: Libraries Administrative Council

APPENDIX 2

WORKING DOCUMENT ON SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

7/30/93

BACKGROUND FOR SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

There are several reasons for evaluating service locations for possible consolidation. The Libraries staffing levels were reduced due to a 5% reduction for the 93/95 biennium and funding of classified staff upgrades It is incumbent upon the Libraries to examine ways to reduce costs. Additionally, there is the possibility of further reductions resulting from the possible passage of Initiative 601/602. Second, the quality of library service is threatened from continuing to stretch reduced staff across a number of service locations. Finally, information technology, document delivery, and the enhancements possible in a networked environment may provide new opportunities for alternative methods of delivering services.

GOAL OF THE SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

The goal of the Service Location Evaluation is to examine current service locations and evaluate whether consolidating any locations would result in improved user services and/or cost savings. The goal of any consolidation would be to enhance services, avoid further erosion of service quality, and reduce expenditures. Examples of enhanced services include: longer hours of access to collections and services; access to a larger, broader and related collections; access to more or better library equipment, etc.

CRITERIA FOR SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

The "Criteria for Service Location Evaluation" (draft 5/25/93) will be used to identify locations for possible consolidation. Critical factors will determine whether or not a service location is a candidate for consolidation. The following weighted factors should be used to sort locations:

Initial Sort

*Is there space in which to move the service location if consolidated?

*How close would such a consolidated service location be to the current location and the department(s) served?

*Number of primary user departments and faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates in these departments. This factor addresses the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

*Departmental use of other service locations and collections.

Second Level Sort

*Potential for innovative service patterns.

*Interdisciplinary use of the service location.

*Adequacy of current space.

Further Sort

*Current use patterns and primary services which can be offered in other locations.

*Critical services provided in current location which can't be offered from another location.

*Security of collections, personnel, and users.

COSTS

The service location evaluation should identify the costs involved in running current service locations, recurring savings anticipated through consolidation, costs of providing alternative modes of service, and one-time costs of consolidations. There will be considerable short-term costs associated with planning an actual move and merger of any consolidated service locations--review of collections for weeding and storage, relabeling, changing bibliographic records, physical move, etc.

PROPOSED TIME FRAME FOR COMPLETE PROJECT

August-November 1993	Fine-tuning of criteria, articulation of process, seek appropriate input and involvement, conduct evaluation, make report.
December 1993-January 1994	Identify any service locations for consolidation.
February-May 1994	External consultation.
Summer 1994	Actual consolidation of any locations identified.

Drafted by Betsy Wilson, Steve Hiller, and David Wood
7/15/93, revised 7/30/93

APPENDIX 3

CRITERIA
FOR SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

USERS

- Number of primary user departments
- Number of faculty, graduate students and undergraduates in these departments
- Users from other departments
- Primary user group's use of other libraries
- Primary user group's unique needs
- Primary user group's connectivity to campus network
- Enrollment patterns of departments served
- Unit responsiveness to users
- Future research and curricular patterns of departments served

REASONS FOR USE

- Collections (new journal issues? bound journals? books? other?)
- Reference
- Reserves
- Instruction
- Study
- Electronic information services
- Support for instructional methods
- Unique services
- Other

LEVEL OF USE

- Circulation activity
- Reference activity
- Instructional activity
- Turnstile count
- Reserves

FACILITIES

- Meets standards for study, collection, service, and staff space
- Meets ADA requirements
- Health and Safety
- Photocopy services
- Network connections
- Is additional space available if needed?
- Preservation conditions

CRITERIA FOR SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

COLLECTIONS

- Collection size
- Completeness of the collection (central intellectual core of discipline)
- Interdisciplinary nature of collection
- Related material in other collections
- Special formats
- Duplication and overlap with other collections
- Preservations issues
- Equipment needed to access collections

LOCATION

- Proximity to other campus libraries
- Proximity to primary users

ACCESS

- Hours of opening
- Special equipment required for access to the collection or services
- Disabled access (to Unit & also within Unit)

STAFFING

- Adequacy of staff resources
- Librarians
- Support staff
- Student assistants
- Vacancies

SECURITY

- Users
- Staff
- Collections
- Equipment

OTHER

- Viability of service alternatives
- Space availability in other related libraries
- Department / College / School support for library
- Surveys results and user comments
- Accreditation requirements
- Utilization of vacated library space

APPENDIX 4

Illustration of Proportion of Use for Primary Branch and Suzzallo and Allen Libraries

COLLEGE OF FOREST RESOURCES USE OF LIBRARY UNITS

	QUARTERLY (1)	MONTHLY (3)	WEEKLY (10)	SCORE	
FACULTY - 19 responses					
SUZZALLO/ALLEN UNITS					
Circulation	1				
Government Publications	**2**			**2**	
Information Desk	1				
Main Collection	2				
Maps	**1**			**1**	
Natural Sciences	**1**	**6**	**3**	**49**	
Periodicals		**2**		**6**	
Ref and Research	1				
SUZZALLO/ALLEN SCORE					**58**
OTHER UNITS					
Architecture	1			1	
Business	1	1		4	
Chemistry		1		3	
East Asia	1			1	
Engineering	4	2	1	20	
Fisheries	3			3	
Forest Resources	**1**	**10**	**7**	**101**	
Geography		1		3	
Health Sciences	1			1	
Mathematics Research	2			2	
				139	
FOREST RESOURCES SCORE					**101**
FACULTY USE OF SUZZALLO/ALLEN	**58/159**	**36%**			
GRADUATE STUDENTS -- 14 responses					
SUZZALLO/ALLEN UNITS					
Circulation	6	4			
Government Publications	**3**	**2**		**9**	
Information Desk	2				
Main Collection	1	2			
Maps	**3**	**2**		**9**	
Microforms	**1**	**1**		**4**	
Natural Sciences		**7**	**3**	**51**	
Periodicals	**1**	**3**	**2**	**30**	
Ref and Research		2			

COLLEGE OF FOREST RESOURCES USE OF LIBRARY UNITS

	QUARTERLY (1)	MONTHLY (3)	WEEKLY (10)	SCORE	
Special Collections	**2**	**1**		**5**	
SUZZALLO/ALLEN SCORE					**108**
OTHER UNITS					
Architecture		2		6	
Chemistry	1		1	11	
Engineering	1	2	1	17	
Fisheries	2			2	
Forest Resources	**3**	**9**	**12**	**99**	
Health Sciences			1	10	
Undergraduate	2	2		8	
				153	
FOREST RESOURCES SCORE					99

GRADUATE STUDENT USE OF SUZZALLO/ALLEN 108/207 (52%)

APPENDIX 5

TASK FORCE ON SERVICE LOCATION EVALUATION

The Task Force on Service Location Evaluation has scheduled an interview with you within the next few days. Along with a large amount of quantifiable data, the Task Force is also collecting more qualitative and subjective information concerning services and clientele in your unit.

The enclosed Library Profile and the following questions will serve as discussion points during the scheduled interview. Please read through the questions now and consider how you might answer them. Other issues may occur to you during the interview. The interview is a collaborative effort, part of an attempt to compile as complete a picture as possible of your branch library and how it functions within the academic community.

****

1. How would you describe the types of patrons that typically use this library? This information can be impressionistic and need not be backed up with statistics or other evidence.

   Do you serve a core group of "regulars" among the faculty and/or graduate students? This group could be members of the department/discipline you serve, or other regular users from on and off campus.

   Do you have many one-time-only users?

   Do a majority of users return to work on a variety of research topics, or long standing research that is developing over time and is heavily dependent on the holdings or unique services in your library?

   Are you beginning to see general use of the campus network via your x-terminals and pcs (i.e. initial bibliographic searching not specifically related to your library)? Has this activity led to a greater number of referrals to other parts of the system or to Suzzallo & Allen?

   Are you seeing any trends such as the use of full-text electronic resources rather than print collections?

   And do you hear back from library users on their successes or failures beyond your branch library? Do you have any established dialogues with your patrons concerning the rest of the library system?

   Other ideas or concerns about your users.

2. What kinds of special services are currently offered or on your want list in your branch library? Include staff expertise, electronic resources unique to your branch, special in-house files, indexes, other finding aids.

   Does the close proximity of your branch with the primary department it serves enhance in any particular way the services you offer and/or help in terms of communicating with the faculty?

   Is staff expertise bolstered by the location of the library, in feeling more a part of the academic scene, or being more in touch with curricular developments?

   Describe ALL unique in-house finding aids that are in use in your branch.

3. Do you see some disadvantages to consolidating your branch library with the main collections?

   Could some unique services be maintained? Are they all "portable?"

   Could some services continue to be available within the department, or in the building, in some way, if the library itself were removed?

   Can you comment on the political aspects of such a consolidation?

   Other disadvantages?

4. Do you see any ADVANTAGES in consolidating your branch library with the main collections in Suzzallo & Allen?

   You might consider longer hours of opening, and staffed public service desks on nights and weekends.

   More stacks space

   Integration of collection with similar materials already located in Suzzallo & Allen

   Greater security

   Other advantages

5. Does your Dept/College/School offer any special library support?

   Provide equipment or software, online systems?

6. If your library is consolidated elsewhere, what would you recommend be done with the vacated space?

   Is the space currently being used for non library functions (receptions, dept functions)?

7. Does your Dept/College/School have any enhanced or special services in close proximity to the library?

   Copy Centers?

   Computer Labs?

   Study Facilities?

   Any other comments, ideas, suggestions, concerns you have:

STRATEGIC AND FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

University Libraries
University of Washington
November 21, 1997

- I. STRATEGIC PLAN
  - A. Executive Summary
  - B. Academic Mission
  - C. Major Strategic Goals
  - D. Peer Institution Comparisons
- II. FACILITY MASTER PLAN UPDATE: 1999-2001 Capital Budget Request
  - A. Executive Summary
  - B. Facility Deficiencies and Impact on Programs
  - C. Proposals to Remedy Deficiencies in Facilities
    - The Three Master Plan Proposals
    - Capital Projects for the Future

I. STRATEGIC PLAN

A. Executive Summary

Strategic planning became a formal process for the University Libraries in 1991, with the involvement of all levels of staff as well as users of the Libraries in that Plan. The second major Strategic Plan was written in 1995, with an update in 1996, and we are now working through the goals set in this Plan. In 1998 we will undertake another update of the Plan.

The Vision Statement below sets the framework for the University Libraries' strategic planning process:

- We envision a user-centered library in which quality services and user satisfaction are goals recognized and shared by all staff.
- We are committed to relevant and individualized service; enhancing lifelong learning, stimulating critical thinking, and promoting innovative research and teaching.
- We envision the University Libraries to be a leader in information management and in the creative use of new technologies.
- The University Libraries will remain an open and inviting place, recognized for providing and protecting an intellectually rich environment.

The purpose of the Strategic Plan is to affirm the vision and mission of the University Libraries and to identify the strategic direction and critical areas needing attention. The goals and objectives in the Plan have evolved from and are interwoven with the regular tasks which are required to fulfill the Libraries' mission.

The University Libraries' five strategic goals are:

1. Enhance and strengthen services based on user needs.
2. Expand and enhance access to and retrieval and delivery of information resources based on user needs.
3. Strengthen human resources.
4. Provide effective and flexible organizational infrastructure.
5. Improve facilities for users, staff, and collections to support Libraries goals and objectives.

Two initiatives were articulated in the 1996 update of our Plan:

1. Develop and enhance collaborative efforts with individuals and groups to achieve strategic goals.
2. Develop a Libraries approach for the University Initiatives Fund.

B. Academic Mission

The mission of the University Libraries is to improve the educational, research, and service programs of the University through the dissemination of knowledge. The Libraries acquires, manages, and promotes the creation and use of knowledge in an atmosphere where information and ideas are readily accessible and freely exchanged.

1. Role of the University Libraries within the University.

The University Libraries provides support for the research, instructional, and service activities of all faculty, students, and staff of the University of Washington. It works with each academic program to acquire, catalog, and preserve collections in all physical formats (print, microform, multimedia, and electronic) and to provide access to information resources which may be located at places throughout the world. The Libraries provides reference assistance and, increasingly instruction for users in techniques for accessing and evaluating information resources. The Libraries recruits and develops a highly skilled staff who participate in a variety of ways in the intellectual life of the University, and who play an active role in University affairs.

The Libraries fulfills its mission by providing a broad array of traditional library services, including reference service, user instruction, circulation and reserves. At the same time, it is making the transition to the electronic environment. With special funding from the University and essential support from Computing & Communications, the Libraries has implemented new systems and provides public terminals, online information resources, and a gateway to the world-wide network via the World Wide Web, UWIN and WILLOW. UWIN and WILLOW were developed in the first half of the decade and have been extremely successful in linking both onsite and remote users with online information resources available through the University Libraries. Within the next year, the Libraries will begin utilizing the World Wide Web as its primary information gateway.

During the 1990's, the University Libraries has become an information and services-centered library, while at the same time maintaining the importance of its traditional collections. This dual effort is having a profound impact on the services the Libraries can offer and which are demanded by our users. Librarians now offer knowledge management instruction to students and faculty and are much more engaged in offering advice on search strategies and management of personal information resources. Traditional reference desk activities and staffing patterns are changing as well. Because of complex information resources, the Libraries must provide more documentation and written instruction, and help screens for users. The Libraries now offers training in methods to evaluate Web resources. In addition, the Libraries is more often interacting with patrons electronically and has begun to establish a full range of online services, including reference, circulation notices, and placement of holds.

The University Libraries participated in the creation of the1994 pilot project which soon became known as the UWired Program. A cooperative venture by Undergraduate Education, Computing & Communications, Educational Outreach, and the University Libraries, the initial focus of UWired was on integrating information literacy and information technology into the course curriculum for entering freshmen. By the end of the 1995-96 academic year, the Odegaard Undergraduate Library had provided the location for three UWired Collaboratories (electronic classrooms designed for collaboration) for students, and the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology for faculty, TA's and librarians. The UWired Program has expanded throughout the University curriculum, and librarians are active partners in building information literacy components into key courses in all departments. UWired expands and changes each year to encompass more of the educational and outreach aims of the University, and the Libraries continues to be involved in the planning and implementation of each facet of the Program.

A series of statistics demonstrates the work the Libraries performs in pursuit of its goals. On a daily basis approximately:

25,000 people enter the Libraries' facilities
4,120 books and journals are checked out
6,000 books and journals are used in the Libraries
7,440 electronic searches are done on Libraries databases
3,890 hits are recorded on the Libraries home page on the Web
29,000 paper photocopies are made
850 photocopies are made from microfilm
2,300 reference questions are answered in person, over the phone, or by e-mail
5 instruction sessions are provided
240 books are loaned to other libraries
200 volumes are acquired
300 titles are cataloged
620 new serial issues are checked in
110 items are sent to the bindery
615 bibliographic records are added to the database

In addition, the approximately 30 group study rooms which are located in 5 libraries are always in demand whenever these libraries are open. Over 450 public terminals throughout the University Libraries are constantly in use during open hours. Units such as the Microforms-Newspapers Collection consistently have 20 to 40 library users using their unique materials from the moment they open until closing time.

2. Role of the University Libraries in the region.

Beyond its commitment to the primary users of the University Libraries (the students, faculty, and staff of the University of Washington), the Libraries makes an important contribution to the citizens of the region. As the largest research library in the Pacific Northwest, the University Libraries shares its collections and the expertise of the librarians on its staff. Anyone may come to the Libraries and make use of the extensive collections onsite. A survey taken in 1996 revealed that more than 10,000 visits per week to the University

Libraries were from those not affiliated with the University of Washington. Through the Libraries Resources Sharing Service, anyone in the State and beyond can request that their own library borrow books and journal articles from the University Libraries collections.

The University Libraries is a major contributor to the Council of Presidents Cooperative Library Project for the State of Washington's four-year academic institutions. Through its partnership in UWired, the University Libraries participates with the UW in the K-20 Project for Washington State. Other projects include digitizing unique resources in the University Libraries collections to share beyond the University, working collaboratively with other libraries in the State and region to license shared databases, and a joint proposal with the Museum of History and Industry and the Eastern Washington Historical Society for a Library of Congress/Ameritech grant.

3. Changes in information technology mean changes in library use.

The use of the Libraries' physical facilities is changing. Increasingly there is a demand for space where groups of students can work on team projects. The new Foster Business Library's group study rooms have been solidly booked from opening day, and the other libraries which have group study rooms report constant use as well. Another trend in the use of space is the need for public computers with access to the Web/Internet near to the service desks so that librarians can assist users in accessing and evaluating the material they find. Print collections and online resources are now used together in a wide variety of combinations, and proximity of librarians and service desks to both types of access tools is the key to providing the user with the best research experience.

The maintenance of the Libraries' book and journal collections and a place to have access to them is still a priority for faculty and graduate and undergraduate students. A survey of UW faculty and students completed in 1995 revealed that 70% of faculty use the Libraries at least weekly. Of these faculty, 60% were remote users and 40% physically visited the Libraries. 60% of students reported weekly in-person visits to the Libraries. While faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates all reported that they use the Libraries as a place to do research, the undergraduates in particular use the Libraries as a place to do their studying and classwork preparation. When asked what categories of library materials would be most useful to them during the next two years, print journals and print books were listed as crucial by faculty and graduate students in all academic areas.

In the same survey, nearly all faculty and most graduate and undergraduate students reported that they have access to a computer that is connected to the campus computer network. Respondents said that they wanted the Libraries to provide training in the use of electronic tools such as the World Wide Web and specific databases. They also said that the preferred method of communication about library services and programs was through e-mail. Electronic reserves and the delivery of full-text to the computer workstation were also listed as highly desirable.

Independent of this survey, the Libraries is receiving an increasing number of requests from faculty for assistance in building their own databases, and librarians are working with several faculty members now on such projects.

The University Libraries envisions a Digital Library in the not-too-distant future, building on its success in using technology and expanding electronic resources. A Digital Library will make available full-text, numeric, and image data over the campus and worldwide Internet. The following scenario illustrates what the Digital Library will enable faculty and students to do:

. . . A UW environmental studies project is aimed at discovering the links between

> *environmental exposures to disease and low income and minority communities. From her apartment in Tacoma, a medical geography student connects via her laptop to the UW Digital Library World Wide Web interface and searches several databases simultaneously with a natural language query. The results of the search include references which are linked to full-text articles, pictures and graphs that can be printed instantly. She then opens up a Geographic Information System (GIS) program, takes the data listing disease incidents in the State, and maps minority and low income distribution in the Tacoma area. She then builds a class presentation using information from the journal articles, images from the Internet, and her disease distribution map. She e-mails her instructor and her classmates, located in every county in Washington; through her Web address, her presentation is available to them immediately through the high-speed Internet II connection. Other class participants emulate this exercise to cover the entire state . . .*

As part of the Digital Library, the University Libraries will structure custom tools and outreach training to foster student, faculty, staff, and community self-sufficiency so that our users can effectively locate, access, evaluate, and assimilate information, regardless of its location, from across the disciplines. Significant benefits accrue to the users of the Digital Library, including improved productivity for faculty, students, staff, and lifelong learners. Electronic delivery of information results in critical time savings for the UW community and will make possible access to resources for geographically or time-dispersed programs.

4. Changes in the University environment.

Changes made by the UW to increase access or respond to other educational needs of the citizens of the State of Washington will affect the University Libraries. Enrollment increases mean that the Libraries must provide more books, journals and other information resources, more user seating, more library instruction sessions, and more staff hours to handle the increased demand at the service desks and through electronic communication. An expanded Summer Quarter will impact the Libraries in all areas, including hours of opening, library instruction, reference and research services, course reserves, circulation services, equipment and facilities replacement, and operational costs. As the UW responds to the growing demand for access and asynchronous, distance learning, the University Libraries must be able to provide the content – the course material and primary sources – necessary to bridge the gap in time and space for those students via the Digital Library. New programs and new areas of faculty research all need library collections, library staff, and library facilities support. It is also quite likely that some of the present and future University Initiatives Fund proposals will have an impact on the University Libraries collections, staff, and facilities.

Constrained budgets for the University have continued to be a defining factor in the environment in which the University Libraries must operate. The Libraries seeks to use its existing resources and funding creatively so that the users are always well served. However, it is inevitable that the combination of cost increases and budget cuts will have an effect on the size and quality of the collections and on the ability of the staff to provide service. Without support for enrollment increases or the expanded Summer Quarter or new academic programs as they occur, the Libraries must either cannibalize its existing budget or must decline to support the new programs.

C. Major Strategic Goals

The University Libraries current and planned programs all relate to these themes: 1) Quality of information resources, whether they are in traditional or innovative sources; 2) Utilization of technology to insure accessibility to the maximum number of resources, whether they are here at the University or elsewhere; 3)

Provision of facilities which protect and make accessible the Libraries' collections and which invite research and collaboration by creating properly equipped and well-lit spaces for individuals and groups; 4) Support, training, and recruitment of a highly skilled staff to ensure the delivery of information to library users. The Libraries strategic goals and initiatives emanate from these themes.

The five goals and two initiatives in the current plan are listed below.

Strategic Goals

1. Enhance and strengthen services based on user needs.
Libraries staff will provide essential, appropriate services directly to the primary users, the faculty, students, and staff of the University, and will expand and improve those services which enable the user to be more self-suffiecient. Objectives to achieve this goal include ongoing user needs assessments, implementing an integrated public service program, coordinating system-wide user education programs, developing and implementing electronic enhancements of user services, assessing current library services and future needs for distance education students and faculty, and assessing the impact of enrollment increases on library services and collections.

2. Expand and enhance access to and retrieval and delivery of information resources based on user needs.
The Libraries' mission to acquire, manage, and promote the creation and use of knowledge is a mandate to be as inclusive as possible, within available fiscal capability, in selecting information resources based on the needs of users. All relevant information in whatever format or medium is subject to inclusion among the resources available to University Libraries users.

3. Strengthen human resources.
The critical element for excellence in the University Libraries is a well-trained, highly motivated staff with diverse backgrounds, experience, skills and education. To attract and retain staff of the highest caliber, every effort will be made to increase staff compensation and to support training for new technologies and overall development of staff.

4. Provide effective and flexible organizational infrastructure.
The Libraries, if it is to remain vital and able to respond rapidly to the changing technological, fiscal and academic environment, must be flexible, capable of change and have sufficient funding resources. The Libraries will make specific changes and decisions to streamline structure, to distribute authority and responsibility, and to seek external funding sources.

5. Improve facilities for users, staff, and collections to support Libraries goals and objectives.
The Libraries as a physical entity is an important presence for research and collaboration in the academic life of the University. Through rearrangement and improvement of existing facilities and creation of new facilities, the Libraries will provide appropriate and inviting research and learning locations.

Strategic Initiatives

I. Develop and enhance collaborative efforts with individuals and groups to achieve strategic goals.
Collaboration in learning, teaching, and research is essential to the academic endeavor. The Libraries will make concerted efforts to build new partnerships on and off campus with the goal of enhancing service, resource availability, research, and learning opportunities for its primary clientele.

II. Develop a Libraries approach for the University Initiatives Fund.
The Libraries will develop UIF funding proposals for important programmatic initiatives, new or existing,

that will result in a significant enhancement to the quality of the University. Partnerships with other campus units will be sought, including involvement in non-Libraries proposals which impact services and information resources that the Libraries must provide.

D. Peer Institution Comparisons

The table below provides data and rankings on five quantitative elements that are important in measuring the relative size of university libraries. Data are shown for the libraries of the 24 peer institutions identified by the Higher Education Coordinating Board.

The University of Washington Libraries rankings range from 2 - 6, depending on the category. In addition to being consistently strong in these general areas, the Libraries includes nationally ranked collections in fisheries, forestry, and East Asian, Scandinavian, Slavic, and South Asian studies. Also, the Pacific Northwest Collection is unique in its comprehensiveness. The University Libraries is the 15th largest among members of the Association of Research Libraries.

Peer Institution Table

II. FACILITY MASTER PLAN UPDATE: 1999-2001 Capital Budget Request

A. Executive Summary

This Plan presents a vision of a library system which occupies fewer, more consolidated locations, and includes as a cornerstone, electronic distribution of many services to the researcher's desktop in the faculty office, the residence hall, and the home. We foresee that the electronic library will continue to be an addition to the print-based library, rather than a replacement for it. Moreover, the transition to the electronic environment will proceed at different paces in different disciplines. These variations must be reflected in all of the Libraries' strategic planning, and they are an important characteristic of the capital projects proposed in this document.

In the ten-year time frame of the original University Libraries Master Plan, dated 1994, and in this update, there will be a continuing need for the library as place, that is, for the library as an integrative location, a commons, which all members of the University community recognize as a central and defining part of University life. The Libraries will continue to house significant and growing collections on campus and off-site, to provide learning and research space for faculty and students, and to provide centralized access to terminals and networked information resources.

The University Libraries presently includes 19 locations on the Seattle campus and one each at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. The Kane Hall Auxiliary Stacks is also on the Seattle campus. Additional units are located at the Harborview Hospital, and at the Friday Harbor Laboratory as well as an off-site collection shelving facility in Seattle near N.E. 105th and Aurora. Libraries facilities planning is driven by currently inadequate space for some library units, the changing nature of scholarship and the increased emphasis on interdisciplinary work, the enrollment increases, the requirements of new technologies, planning for the move of the life and natural sciences departments to the southwest campus, and the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. This Plan proposes a series of capital projects designed to address these issues and to position the Libraries to continue to offer excellent support to the academic and research programs of the University in the 21st century. An additional benefit of this plan to the University is that two of the projects release space in campus buildings for other uses.

Central to the Libraries Facilities Master Plan is the availability, just confirmed, of a collection shelving facility at Sand Point. The Sand Point facility will allow the Libraries to maintain quick and convenient access to essential but less-used research materials that no longer fit into the branch libraries and the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries. In addition, it will now be possible for crowded library units to increase user research and consultation space. Phase one of the Sand Point facility renovation includes a service point on the 1st floor. From this service point, Libraries staff will retrieve materials from the collections housed on the 3rd floor. The planned service point includes a reading room for faculty and students who wish to come directly to Sand Point, but it also will be equipped with a fax machine, a scanner, a computer workstation, and other electronic means for Libraries staff to transfer information directly to the user. Responsive and quick document delivery from Sand Point to the Seattle campus Libraries is an essential part of the planned service for this facility.

The Sand Point facility and the Kane Hall Auxiliary Stacks area both figure into the plans for providing surge space for collections and staff during the Suzzallo Renovation Project (first on the list below of needed Libraries capital projects). The Kane Hall Auxiliary Stacks area, currently used by the Libraries as a collection shelving facility, is full to capacity. We plan to remove collections currently shelved in Kane to Sand Point (with the exception of some East Asia material shelved in Kane). During Suzzallo Renovation, collections and staff-processing operations currently housed in the Suzzallo Sub-basement will be relocated temporarily to Kane.

In the long term, relocating material currently in Kane Hall to the Sand Point facility also provides an opportunity to alleviate extreme crowding of the collections in the East Asia Library (EAL). We propose expanding the area available to the East Asia collection within Kane, utilizing the compact shelving that already exists, to a total of 8,144 square feet. In addition, Room 10 in OUGL, already occupied by the Libraries for surge space in preparation for the Suzzallo Renovation, would be turned over to the East Asia Library after Suzzallo Renovation, to be used as an office for staff and for reading space for users of the EAL collection housed in Kane. Minor capital project money will be requested to install partitions in order to secure this part of Kane for the EAL collection.

The proposed capital projects are:

1. Completion of Phase One of the Suzzallo Renovation Project which is now ready for the construction phase. Phase One is primarily an infrastructure project to address seismic, HVAC, fire alarm and fire safety, emergency egress, disabled access and electrical and communications issues. The project also provides the opportunity to make some changes in the facility to enhance the Libraries' service program and to provide additional and improved user space. The Suzzallo Project involves the renovation of approximately 325,000 GSF/200,666 ASF. Deferral has serious implications for life/safety of individuals who work and study in the Suzzallo building and for continued high maintenance costs for the University.

2. Construction of a Fine Arts Library (approximately 33,300 ASF) for a state-of-the-art multi-media, collection, study, instruction, and research facility to combine the existing (and very crowded) Art (4,884 ASF) and Drama (2,432 ASF) Libraries, and the Music Library and Music Listening Center (4,938 ASF). Deferral means that these crowded branch libraries will be less and less able to serve their constituencies.

3. Construction of a new Natural Sciences/Natural Resources Library (approximately 47,000 ASF) to combine the current Natural Sciences, Fisheries-Oceanography, and Forest Resources Libraries, and components of the Maps and Cartographic Information Service. This proposal is driven in part by the planning for the Life Sciences buildings on the southwest campus. If deferred, the academic departments will be located a great distance from essential library materials and services. Electronic access will not be a

complete substitute for in-person services, workstations, or collection access.

Parallel to the capital projects proposed above will be a series of minor capital project requests and programmatic changes to retrofit other Libraries' locations.

Major capital projects in future requests will include the Architecture and Urban Planning Library, the Chemistry Library, the Mathematics Research Library, the Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center, and renovation of the existing Natural Sciences Library space in the Allen Library when NSL moves to the Life Sciences building in the southwest campus.

B. Facility Deficiencies and Impact on Programs

The components of the academic research library which support the university's teaching and research are:

- A sizable and carefully selected collection of information resources in a wide variety of formats, including print, electronic, and other non-print formats. Access to numerous networks, databases, and other electronic resources.
- A highly skilled staff, providing a range of information, research, and educational services and programs.
- Safe, well-lit, environmentally sound, comfortable facilities, conducive to individual and collaborative learning and research.

The research library's facilities should encourage and ease access to all types of information resources held in the collections; should accommodate new technologies; should provide protection from extremes of temperature, humidity, and light; should accommodate appropriately sized and equipped staff work spaces; and should permit librarians and staff to interact productively with users in a number of different settings, including individual consultations, seminar formats, auditorium settings, or in computer laboratories. Learning and research space for faculty and students should range from rooms for collaborative groups using Internet and Web resources to tables and other open seating with networked access, to individual carrels for quiet research and consultation of library resources. The spaces provided should reflect the changing pedagogical methods for both undergraduate and graduate education.

Facilities must be well-organized with the proper adjacencies of functions to guide the user through the library and to promote efficient library operations. Furthermore, library facilities must be located on campus to provide convenient access by the maximum number of primary users. As will be discussed a number of times in this document, primary users of any one library unit now frequently come from many different departments.

The University of Washington has made major improvements in its libraries in recent years. The Allen Library, the Physics-Astronomy Library, the new Foster Business Library, and renovations in the Engineering Library and Odegaard Undergraduate Library are examples. There are, however, numerous instances in which library facilities are hampering teaching and research. In the following four sections we will describe the broad categories of facilities needed to support the Libraries' present and future programs. The remaining sections will provide specific descriptions of the Libraries' Facilities Master Plan proposals.

Instruction and Training

The instruction facilities required by today's library staff and users are no less various than those required by faculty members for appropriate interaction with their students. Yet in most of the University's libraries, those facilities are lacking. Technology and curriculum shifts have driven significant changes in libraries and information. As teaching and learning increasingly rely on global networks for the creation, storage, dissemination, and use of knowledge, a new information literacy has emerged. Students of all levels and disciplines need the skills necessary to navigate in this increasingly intense and complex technological environment in o order to become life-long learners. We are experiencing significant changes in university pedagogy – from passive and lecture-centered methods to active, experiential, and problem-centered learning. In order to be successful, and more importantly, excel, in their studies and work beyond the university, students must develop sophisticated information literacy and problem-solving skills, which are increasingly predicated on critical use of knowledge resources and technology.

Librarians in partnership with faculty are incorporating information literacy and knowledge management into both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Librarians serve as guest instructors in regularly scheduled classes, design customized educational programs for specific groups, and team-teach courses.

The Libraries has a comprehensive instruction and training program. In 1996-97, Seattle campus librarians taught 15,626 students in 1,031 classes. Many of these classes were taught in inappropriate settings, not conducive to learning. In Government Publications in the Suzzallo Library, where 741 students were taught in 28 classes in 1996-97, sessions took place primarily in the unit's open reference area where other users must study and consult materials. In the Music Library, where librarians taught 143 students in 24 classes, most sessions took place in one of the crowded study areas. These are not acceptable conditions for learning skills that are crucial for success within the university and in most other areas of endeavor outside the university.

The best problem-centered and resource-based teaching and learning takes place in the library where the full range of resources (print, electronic, multimedia, and archival) come together. Instruction in networked resources requires engaged and hands-on learning in suitably equipped and configured electronic classrooms. Increasingly, students and other users need to be instructed in spaces containing groups of networked workstations where students can practice strategies as the librarian demonstrates them. The Odegaard Undergraduate Library, with the newly upgraded UWired Collaboratories on the 1st floor, does provide this space for librarians in that facility. The Engineering Library now has a smaller such space for the use of its librarians, and the new Foster Business Library included an equipped instructional space.

The program for the Suzzallo Library Renovation (still our top priority in the list of Master Plan Proposals below) adds two electronic classrooms equipped with workstations and projection to support instruction in Suzzallo. The smaller of these rooms is located in the new Government Publications area and will make a tremendous difference in the quality and amount of instruction they are able to offer. The other room, arranged auditorium style, will be adjacent to the Reference and Research Services Division and will allow those librarians to offer instruction to classes numbering from 30 to 60 students.

Instruction in other libraries such as Drama, Art, Music, or Forest Resources now involves either reserving the computer laboratory of the school or college for user education, or trying to group the students in one of the crowded study areas in the library. Sharing laboratory space with the department can work if the laboratory is close enough to the library and if the use of the facility is not so heavy that it hampers access for library instruction. Space internal to the library is preferable so that library materials can be readily integrated into the instruction.

Reference and Research Service

The integration of technology and electronic information with traditional printed reference works has changed the space needs for reference and research services. A flexible service environment which provides spaces for a variety of reference interview and consultation functions is crucial for librarians and the faculty, students, and other users whom they serve. Such an environment includes a desk which facilitates the interaction between librarian and user, and open, flexible space for changing the arrangement of networked workstations to allow students and faculty to move easily among the varying types of information sources they need. Wherever there are opportunities for upgrading and renovating existing space, or constructing new space, the Libraries will substitute compact, easily moveable, and, preferably, modular service desks to increase adaptability to changing user needs.

Librarians must now respond increasingly to requests by users, especially by faculty, graduate students and other advanced researchers, to meet in scheduled consultations in which they plan a research strategy, work out the "program" for database and Web searches, and discuss accessing materials in numerous different formats and locations. These consultations must take place in quiet, private areas which have access to at least one networked workstation. Not enough librarians have access to properly equipped consultation spaces. This is especially a problem in the Libraries' central reference and research services division in the Suzzallo Library, and in the East Asia and Music Libraries. [NOTE: The Suzzallo Renovation plan includes individual offices for the reference librarians in the programmatic changes.] In the Health Sciences Library where librarians frequently consult with users regarding information management skills, the urgency of this need has prompted staff to convert group study space to staff space in which these consultations can take place.

Learning and Research Spaces

The library as a location with a collection of printed materials to be used onsite and a place to study is evolving into an interactive student learning center that is supported by a broad range of onsite resources and digital sources available through the World Wide Web and the Internet. To support this change, library space in the future must be flexible enough to accommodate informal study groups of varying sizes, wired for electronic access to resources by computers at virtually any location, and conducive to formal and informal instruction by library staff and faculty.

The user-centered library facility is one in which research spaces respond to the changing needs of students and faculty. Increasingly, the curriculum in many disciplines requires students to work collaboratively in groups or teams on their assignments. Yet group study rooms are available in only a few units: Odegaard Undergraduate, Social Work, Foster Business, and Engineering Libraries. Although there are some group study rooms in the Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center, more are needed. Growing numbers of classes in the Health Sciences are moving to problem-based learning, which treats the library and its resources, both print and electronic, as the ultimate classroom. Students are expected to use library resources in groups that may be simultaneously accessing databases, using printed resources, viewing clinical simulations, using electronic reserve materials, and engaging in heated discussions with instructors and colleagues. Other academic departments throughout campus have likewise moved to resource-based teaching methods which incorporate these kinds of resources. For many subjects, particularly in the social sciences and humanities, the library is the laboratory for learning. The need for group studies is especially acute in the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries; the planned Suzzallo Renovation calls for 10 group study rooms of varying sizes and all with networked access.

A number of academic libraries have begun to create a new kind of library group study facility. Two examples are the Leavey Teaching Library at the University of Southern California, and the Grainger Engineering Library at the University of Illinois. Sometimes called collaboratories because they provide space for collaborations among faculty members, students, and librarians, or for other project teams, these facilities will be equipped with powerful, networked computer workstations and appropriate multi-media equipment. Every available electronic information resource is accessible through the "gateway" workstations in these rooms. Located within easy access of traditional library resources, these facilities will support in a unique and innovative way, the changing needs of university library users. On this campus, the UWired Collaboratories, the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, and the UWired Commons, all located within the Odegaard Undergraduate Library, have begun to fulfill this need.

User space of any kind, whether for individuals or groups, is inadequate in many of the branch libraries because of collection growth. Shelving has had to be increased at the expense of user research space. In the Mathematics Research Library, for example, the square footage allocated to most seats is well below 20 square feet. A standard of 30 square feet for an individual allows enough room to add a portable or hardwired computer, and also room to consult books and take notes.

Study seats should be designed properly to accommodate people with disabilities. Librarians in individual facilities have taken the initiative to adjust selected seats but further progress in this area must be a goal of the Master Plan. It will be important to provide several more study rooms especially designed for users with disabilities. These must be equipped with workstations that respond to the needs of sight and hearing impaired students and must be adjusted to accommodate wheel chairs. The four small study rooms for people with disabilities in Suzzallo are located in an isolated portion of the building, are away from collections and services, do not have fire/safety alarms, and do not have networked access. One of the large group study rooms in the Suzzallo Renovation is designated for users with disabilities.

Fixed desks and bulky library furniture often make it impossible for librarians to adapt facilities to meet changing program needs without significant funding. An example of this is in the Forest Resources Library where the facility itself, a large rectangle with few permanent partitions, is relatively flexible. However, bulky or fixed furnishings are restricting the librarian's ability to add workstations or to provide additional study seating close to outlets or away from noise centers. Progress was made in the Allen Library and to some degree in Suzzallo, in acquiring more compact and flexible furnishings, but the Libraries must continue to seize opportunities to make these improvements.

No one should have to select seating on the basis of room temperature. In Suzzallo, users frequently complain that seating is located in areas that are either too warm or too cold. Inconsistent or fluctuating temperatures affect both books and people. Lighting for study seating should be designed by qualified consultants and should be consistent throughout the Libraries. The even and consistent lighting in the Allen Library has been successful. Users should have the option of using portable computers at their library study seats and should have the option of connecting to the campus network. Again, power is available at seats in the Allen Library and in a handful of other locations, but not consistently throughout the Libraries.

Enrollment increases will mean an even greater demand for learning and research space, adding to the issues described above. The Libraries' strategy must be to leverage the existing square footage in the Seattle campus Libraries and the Sand Point facility along with any future facilities projects to accommodate this increased demand. Therefore, the Libraries will take opportunities in all facilities projects to create learning and research spaces that respond to the changing needs of faculty, students, and other users.

Housing Library Collections

Dramatic changes are affecting university research libraries in these last years of the 20th century. There is no aspect of the administration of research libraries in which the pattern of change is more clearly demonstrated than in balancing new technologies with existing and growing print collections. There is currently a rapid move from the traditional collection-based environment to the service-centered library founded on the expanding electronic network of information resources which are increasingly easy to use and are extremely powerful. Yet hard copy collections are still heavily used, must be housed, and will continue to grow indefinitely, albeit at slower rates. Our challenge is to continue providing access to print collections for a majority of users and at the same time to provide the space and facilities required for networked information use.

It is useful to examine the balance between printed and electronic publication rates. Total US and foreign printed book publication between 1990-92 averaged 700,000 new book titles/editions per year. 1994 output was approximately 800,000 new book titles/editions. U.S. figures for 1995 reflected the highest number of new book titles/editions ever recorded -- 62,039, exceeding the previous high of 56,027 in 1987. In 1992 there were 118,500 hard copy serials available worldwide; in 1994 this figure increased to more than 140,000 hard copy serials published throughout the world. The 1997 figure was over 156,000 for serial titles in hard copy only. Current projections by publishers, scholars and librarians do not indicate a diminution of print publishing in the foreseeable future. As long as there are large numbers of printed titles being produced, the Libraries will be responsible for acquiring and providing them for its users.

Electronic publication rates are increasing at an even higher rate. By 1997 there were 6,661 serial titles either exclusively online or in addition to the hard copy version, and there were 2,240 serials available on CD-ROM. While it is clear that there is a growing receptivity to electronic publications, not everyone does or will feel comfortable reading electronic formats; not everyone will be able to afford access to these formats; and conversion of restrospective titles will be slow and expensive, leaving many millions of titles unconverted.

Therefore, the University Libraries must confront on a long term basis the problem of housing hard-copy collections. Large new library buildings cannot continue to be constructed in the thirty year cycles that we have enjoyed in the 20th century. Conversion to space saving formats such as microforms and electronic formats can provide some relief. Yet, as discussed above, slow user acceptance and high conversion costs will decrease the viability of this strategy for at least the coming decade.

Within the University Libraries the average of six year's net growth in all Libraries' printed volume collections between 1985 and 1991, was 72,800 volumes per year. The same figure for 1996-97 was 91,540 volumes. At a conservative average of 18.2 volumes per square foot (national standards suggest a planning figure of 10 to 12 volumes per square foot), that amounts to a Libraries-wide bound volume collection growth of 4,000 - 5,000 square feet per year. Other formats such as maps, microforms, and government documents are growing at an average of 3,800 square feet per year. This amounts to 7,800 - 8,800 square feet of annual growth, approximately the same amount as that contained in the entire Social Work Library.

However, it seems likely that the rate of growth of the Libraries hard-copy collections will diminish in the next few years. Funding constraints for higher education will result in a dip in collection growth rates in the next biennium. Along with this dip, continued inflation of publications costs, the availability of and increasing user acceptance of other formats, and other factors are sure to continue this trend. Assuming that the rate of growth in the hard copy collections begins to decreases at a rate of 3% per year over the next five years, this still leaves annual growth in excess of 7,000 square feet in the year 2004.

This continued substantial growth makes it crucial to examine the current and projected availability of library shelving space. The Allen Library (completed in 1991) was built primarily to solve the collection space problem in the main humanities and social sciences collections and in special collections, government publications, maps, natural sciences, and microforms-newspapers. If the only growth Suzzallo and Allen had needed to accommodate were for the collections within them, there would have been growth room available until 2001.

In 1994 three branch libraries (Geography, Philosophy, Political Science) were consolidated and their collections moved into the Suzzallo and Allen stacks. The fine arts and architecture branch libraries are so full that they must transfer material to the Suzzallo and Allen stacks on a regular basis. Factoring in the new books which have been added annually to the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries since Allen was built, the total annual increase has been 30,000 to 40,000 volumes, and the stacks in these two libraries are now 85% full. It should be noted that 85% full is the maximum recommended capacity for library shelves; otherwise the books are packed so tightly on the shelves that users cannot pull them out, reshelving is extremely difficult for library staff, and the books suffer damage.

In the collections exceeding 100%, staff members have added eight shelves to seven-shelf sections and sometimes must place books on top of other shelved books. One unit places books on the floor. The Kane Hall Auxiliary Stacks, the storage facility to which less used materials have been sent from the library system, is now operationally full.

During this time of transition, then, from one era to another in information production, organization, retrieval, and storage, the problem of how to allocate space for hard copy collections is one of the most pressing. Considering all factors which can now be predicted, including the growing success of electronic resources, the cost of capital construction projects, and the ability or the will of the citizenry to support these projects, the wisest course seems to be to plan caps on the sizes of hard copy collections housed in the on-campus libraries. The availability of a large, nearby off-site shelving facility with expedited retrieval and electronic access will relieve the pressure on the on-campus libraries and still allow ready access to the research collections.

The University Libraries and Public Service

The Libraries system plays a vital role in the University's public service mission. Properly planned and well-functioning facilities are a necessity for the Libraries' work in this area. For example, library staff provide tours of the various units for thousands of people each year. These tours and orientations teach school children, Access Program participants, and many others about the workings of a major research library. Librarian subject specialists provide information and consulting services to a wide array of individuals and groups. For instance, the Drama Librarian provides research materials, user education, and material from the repertory collection to members of the Seattle theater community. The Music librarians answer questions from local musical groups, including members of the Seattle Symphony. They are frequently requested to identify pieces of music, and have even assisted in restoring a tape recording of a purported crime for the Seattle Police Department. The Engineering librarians teach inventors and entrepreneurs from this region how to access patents and trademarks.

The Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center provides extensive services to hospitals, physicians and other health care professions in the Northwest. It also experiences heavy onsite use of the collections and services by unaffiliated individuals including UW Medical Center patients, lay public, students from other colleges along the I-5 corridor, lawyers, and drug and bio-technology firms.

Microforms-Newspapers provides reference and research service for practicing journalists from Seattle and other communities and participates in the state-wide Preservation Microfilming Project of the state's newspapers. Photographs from the Libraries historical photography collections appear regularly in local, national, and international newspapers, periodicals, monographs, and on television.

The Nordic Area librarian prepares exhibits from the Libraries' extensive Scandinavian collections for members of the local community, provides reference assistance for citizens interested in genealogy, and has held receptions and tours for the King of Sweden, the ambassadors of Norway and Denmark, the President of Iceland, and the consul generals of each country. Similar examples could be cited from the activities of the Slavic, South Asian, East Asian, History, Fisheries-Oceanography or Mathematics librarians, or many of their colleagues.

None of these services could be performed without high quality facilities to house properly the collections, to support telecommunications and network access, and in which to utilize computers, projectors, and audio and video equipment.

C. Proposals to Remedy Deficiencies in Facilities

In the section that follows are descriptions of the Libraries' top three Facilities Master Plan priorities. These items do not represent all of the work required to achieve system-wide facilities that respond to the Libraries' strategic goals to support the teaching and research of the University, but they are the most urgent and will require the greatest investments of funding.

A second section, entitled "Capital Projects for the Future," details the next tier of essential capital projects.

In addition, the Libraries will continue to submit requests for minor capital improvements for a number of units.

The Three Master Plan Proposals

1. The Suzzallo Library

The 100% construction drawings have been completed and are under review for Phase One of the Suzzallo Renovation Project. Although funding was not received by the University for construction in the 1997-99 biennium, this project remains the highest priority in the Libraries Facilities Master Plan because of serious life/safety and high cost maintenance problems. The Suzzallo Library is among the ten campus buildings most vulnerable to serious damage in an earthquake. The building systems are worn out, obsolete and unable to sustain environmental conditions to preserve the collections and properly house users and staff. Water leaks, improper temperature controls, and inadequate fire suppression systems all represent potential hazards to library materials. Life and safety code issues, old mechanical/ventilation and electrical systems and the presence of asbestos pose potential hazards and uncomfortable situations for library users and staff. Additionally the building must be brought into compliance with the requirements of the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act. The exterior masonry, glass, and roof areas of the 1925 and 1935 sections need to be repaired, cleaned, and sealed.

Programmatic improvements in the Suzzallo Library scheduled for Phase One of the renovation include the addition of nine group study rooms, consultation offices for the humanities and social sciences librarians, and two instruction and training rooms. The Government Publications circulating collection will be on open shelves for the first time. In addition, Central Circulation and Reference and Research Services will be moved up to the 1st floor of Suzzallo, in spaces much more visible and convenient for library users.

Interim solutions: There is no interim solution for the Suzzallo Renovation Project. The life/safety issues listed above do not have any remedy except within the Renovation.

2. Fine Arts Library

The University Libraries Master Plan proposes a new consolidated Fine Arts Library. The existing Art Library (Art Building), Drama Library (Hutchinson Hall), Music Library, and Music Listening Center (Music Building) will be consolidated into this state-of-the-art, multimedia facility. A new consolidated facility would support changes in learning and research in the fine arts resulting from increasingly interdisciplinary work and the influence of technology and multimedia. A new library would also address serious facilities deficiencies in these four branches.

While print and visual collections are the core of fine arts teaching and research, technology is influencing these disciplines as well. Electronic applications in composition in music and stagecraft in drama, and high-resolution digital distribution of art images are now important in supporting curriculum and research. Technological capability in the existing libraries is minimal. There is inadequate learning and research space, and what space is available is not readily adaptable for multimedia purposes. There are no teaching facilities, collaborative work spaces, or computer commons in any of these libraries.

The Art, Drama, Music Library, and Music Listening Center are the Libraries' most over-crowded facilities. Collection space in Art and Music is at 140% and 137% respectively. In the Music Library, staff must pile books on the floor and on counters when large amounts of circulated material return at the end of each quarter. The Drama Library is at 90% capacity. For each book added to the Art and Music Libraries, one must be removed and sent to the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries or to Kane Hall Auxiliary Stacks (although this facility is now full). Following a tour of the four facilities in 1996, the Faculty Council on University Libraries sent a letter to Provost Huntsman supporting a new Fine Arts Library.

The University Libraries Facilities Master Plan includes a proposal for construction of a Fine Arts Library to combine the four facilities. The new facility would be a state-of-the-art multimedia collection, study, instruction, and research facility designed to provide essential support to faculty and students of the three schools. The new facility will emphasize image and sound reproduction capabilities, and will contain well-equipped user education facilities, reference and research services, fully electronic faculty, student, and librarian team collaboration spaces, group and individual study space, and space for collections.

Specifically, the new Fine Arts Library will:

- Bring together related information resources and services in one state-of-the-art facility convenient to faculty and students in art, drama, and music and accessible to users with disabilities.
- Provide the infrastructure, equipment, and staff needed to deliver art images, high-quality sound, scores, play texts, and video workstations throughout the library, to classrooms, and to the desktop.
- Enhance services to students and faculty. None of the present libraries provides collaborative work areas, production facilities, electronic classrooms, or specialized multimedia facilities.
- Provide a facility which meets the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- Provide longer hours of opening. The current open hours vary among the four locations, but none is open later than 9 p.m. during the week, and weekend hours are restricted to 1-5 p.m. on Saturday (Drama is closed entirely on that day) and Sunday. With the consolidation of libraries (e.g. from four circulation desks to one), staff will be reallocated to providing a higher level and an expanded array of technology, research, instructional, and reference services.
- Provide adequate housing, growth space, and preservation for these multi-format collections.

A consolidated Fine Arts Library allows us to bring together the collections and expert staff in a technologically appropriate and modern facility to support the current and future needs of student and faculty in the fine arts. Construction of this library would release approximately 4,938 ASF in the Music Building, 4,884 ASF in the Art Building, and 2,432 ASF in Hutchinson Hall.

COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF SPACE

	Existing ASF	Proposed ASF
Collections	6,497 (53%)	12,765 (38%)
User/Svc. Space	4,329 (35%)	15,849 (48%)
Staff/Processing	1,428 (12%)	4,710 (14%)
TOTAL	12,254 ASF	33,324 ASF

The Fine Arts Library project is one in which potential connections to other programs in the College of Arts and Sciences will be explored. There may well be complementary projects which could feasibly be housed as well in such a facility. In addition, this project should be very attractive to potential donors who are supporters in the fields of music, art, and the theater.

Interim solutions: Only very negative alternatives exist for the Music Library, the Music Library Listening Center, the Art Library and the Drama Library. In lieu of the expanded and upgraded space proposed, these branch libraries will continue to become more crowded and less usable for faculty, students, and other users. While some of the collections can be sent to other sites (the Suzzallo and Allen Libraries or Sand Point), certain core materials must remain onsite for reference, reserve, and the circulating collections. In each case, it is not possible to further reduce the user seating to add more shelving. Nonetheless, as parts of the collections are transferred to alternate shelving facilities, the Libraries will endeavor to make these materials as accessible as possible to the primary users.

3. Natural Sciences/Natural Resources Library

The University Libraries Master Plan proposes a new consolidated Natural Sciences/Natural Resources Library on the southwest part of campus, perhaps in connection with the planned Life Sciences projects. The existing Natural Sciences (Allen Library), Fisheries-Oceanography (Ocean Teaching Building), Forest Resources (Bloedel Hall) libraries and components of the Map Collection (Suzzallo Library) will be consolidated into this facility. Due to elimination of duplicative functions and collections, the new facility, at 47,100 ASF, will actually comprise less space than the 50,600 ASF in the existing libraries.

The growth of interdisciplinary science research and teaching combined with the geographic centralization of most life science and natural resources programs on or near the southwest part of campus makes a strong case for a consolidated new library located close to relevant academic programs. Library use surveys done in 1992 and 1995 show that many users in programs supported by these libraries must visit several different libraries due to the interdisciplinary nature of their research. For example, a student working on changes in salmon habitat would use the Fisheries-Oceanography Library for specific information on salmon and limnology, the Forest Resources Library for forest hydrology and soils, the Natural Sciences Library for geohydrology, climate data and basic biological works, and the Map Collection for geospatial information on land cover and use changes. While an increasing amount of new information will be come available electronically, much of the complementary historical record will remain in paper format.

In addition, surging undergraduate enrollments, especially in the life sciences and forest resources, have placed additional strains on the ability of these libraries to support library needs of undergraduates for computer access, collaborative work areas and instruction and presentation space that create an environment conducive to active learning. The Fisheries-Oceanography Library and the Forest Resources Library are both located in buildings that were constructed thirty years ago, and it is very difficult to provide the type of library services needed now and in the future.

Specifically, the new library will:

- Bring together related information resources in one location that are now in four separate locations. Subject areas and academic programs supported by the library include atmospheric sciences, biology, botany, ecology, environmental studies, fisheries, forest resources, genetics, geology and geophysics, global change, hydrology, marine studies, oceanography, wildlife, and zoology. Cartographic information, including geospatial data, is essential support for many of the above programs.
- Move the life sciences collections closer to users. The botany and zoology departments are located at a greater distance from their primary library – Natural Sciences in the Allen Library – than any other Seattle campus academic department. With the new library situated closer to the Health Sciences, better support will be provided to life sciences research in that area as well.
- Enhance services to undergraduates. None of the present life sciences libraries provide effective support to collaborative undergraduate education. There are no group work areas, instruction rooms, general purpose computer labs, or specialized computing/multimedia facilities. Hours of opening would be increased substantially over what is now offered in most libraries.
- Eliminate duplication in collection, services and staff. Simply put, the new library can operate more effectively and efficiently as a single integrated unit than as four separate ones. Fewer staff will be needed, less space will be devoted to housing collections, and more diversified space provided for users.

The combined collections and expertise of staff, housed in a technologically sophisticated and flexible facility, will form a state-of-the-art information and resource center which can address the needs of interdisciplinary science research, teaching, and learning in the 21st century. The library will be better positioned to support both local use as well as distance learning.

Construction of this library would release approximately 14,042 ASF to the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences and the College of Forest Resources. It would also free space in the Allen and Suzzallo Libraries which would be reassigned to support central campus library needs.

COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF SPACE

	Existing ASF	Proposed ASF
Collections	32,800 (65%)	26,000 (55%)
User/Svc. Space	13,000 (25%)	16,300 (34%)
Staff/Processing	4,800 (9%)	4,800 (10%)
TOTAL	50,600 ASF	47,100 ASF

The Natural Sciences/Natural Resources Library project should be very attractive to donors in a wide variety of academic subject interests.

Interim solutions: The need for the Natural Sciences/Natural Resources Library is great, as outlined above. However, until the new space is achieved, the Libraries will utilize electronic linkages as much as possible to bridge the gap between disciplines which have already relocated to the lower campus with collections which are still located on the upper campus. As collections need to be removed from the most crowded of the branches, the Libraries will endeavor to make them as accessible as possible from the alternative shelving facilities.

Capital Projects for the Future

The libraries listed in this section will be included in future capital projects requests.

1. **The Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center** (HSLIC) currently confronts critical space shortages in both collection and service areas. Programs such as IAIMS (Integrated Academic Information Management System) implementation, new departmental and research initiatives, and new directions in health sciences education are forcing a complete re-thinking of library facilities and services for the health sciences. Collection space is at 100% capacity, and scientists and practitioners alike are predicting a continued dependence on health sciences literature appearing in printed formats. At the same time, growing numbers of classes in the Health Sciences are moving to problem-based learning which treats the library and its resources, both print and electronic, as the experiential classroom. A number of classes meet regularly in the library with active involvement by librarians to collaboratively explore resources ranging from printed reference tools to databases and Web-based electronic serials. To support this educational initiative, library space in the future must be flexible enough to accommodate informal study groups of varying sizes, wired for electronic access to resources by computers at virtually any location in the library, and supportive of formal and informal instruction by library staff and faculty. Enrollment increases are also expected to impact the demand for user space in HSLIC. Finally, it is important to find a solution for HSLIC in order to make space available for expansion of grant and contract initiatives which are a major activity in the Health Sciences.

More exploration must be done with other Health Sciences entities which are housed in T-Wing to determine if there is adjacent space for HSLIC expansion. One possibility is the expansion of the existing basement compact shelving area currently used by HSLIC into contiguous space for collections in order to free up 2nd and 3rd floor areas for instructional and training space, for individual and group research and learning space, and for other services.

2. The **Architecture and Urban Planning Library** is in need of expansion. This library moved to its present location in Gould Hall in 1971. Since that time its collection has more than doubled, while the seating capacity has been decreased by almost one-third in order to accommodate more shelving. This active and important branch library has no teaching space, little space for reference and consultation, and no space for collection growth.

Academic libraries are rapidly being transformed from facilities which house books and journals into places for teaching, learning, and accessing burgeoning digital and networked information resources. A proposal in 1996 projected the enclosure of a 1,000 SF balcony space and renovation of the existing 5,276 SF library to provide properly equipped individual and group spaces for learning and research and to increase the space for collections. The University Libraries will continue to work with the College of Architecture and Urban Planning to pursue this project.

ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN PLANNING LIBRARY PROGRAM
(in square feet)

	Existing ASF	Proposed ASF
Collections	2,586	2,842
Invidividual research space	731	1,200
Group learning/research space	175	348
Computer workstations	100	336
Reference/consulting	169	336
Circulation/Reserve	297	543
Staff/Processing workspace*	1,121	726
TOTAL	5,275 ASF	6,331 ASF

* Will be reorganized to create more user space

3. The **Chemistry Library** was relocated in 1988 from Bagley Hall to the Chemistry Library Building (formerly the Drama-TV Building). The new location provided a better physical environment for library collections, but actually contained less space than in Bagley. Thus, the library was operationally full at the time of the move, and general user seating was reduced to 30% of the Bagley total. Although 15% of the Chemistry collection has been sent to storage during the past seven years, it remains among the most overcrowded branch libraries. In addition to the lack of collection space, the library also ranks low for both quantity and quality of user seating, work space, and computer access. Increasing undergraduate enrollments in Chemistry have exacerbated the situation.

A program statement prepared in 1994 for a proposed move back to Bagley Hall called for a library that contained more than 10,000 square feet of space – or about 2/3 larger than the present 6,000 square feet. These figures are still valid today. The library needs additional space to provide quality workspace for users, computer access to electronic information resources, and adequate housing for collections. Learning and research space for individuals and groups account for 60% of the increased space.

CHEMISTRY LIBRARY PROGRAM

(in square feet)

	Existing ASF	Proposed ASF
Collections	3,350	4,600
Invidividual research space	1,000	3,400
Group learning/research space	225	600
Service areas	790	1,100
Staff/Staff Support	725	800
TOTAL	6,090 ASF	10,500 ASF

4. The **Mathematics Research Library**, located in Padelford Hall, is a crowded, outdated facility. Space and structural constraints severely limit this library's ability to house collections, deliver services, and provide suitable space for users and staff. While a small storage space in the Padelford basement enables most of the collection to be housed in one building (although in two separate locations), this space is nearly full. The library therefore is marginally viable with 37% of the collection in storage, little in the way of service and user space, and very cramped conditions for staff. The design and structure of Padelford

preclude renovation or expansion in the current space, and new and larger space must be provided in order for the library to remain viable. A preliminary program calls for doubling the size of the library in order to provide services that address user needs effectively.

The Mathematics and Statistics Departments both recognize the need for new, expanded space. Both departments rely heavily on the library for research and instructional support and require close access to its resources and services. Mathematics, in particular, has identified expanded space for the library as its top facility need and is committed to working with interested parties to find or construct new space for the library. A new facility should adequately house collections and also contain ample and diverse user spaces and services that can provide effective support for undergraduates and K-12 initiatives.

MATHEMATICS RESEARCH LIBRARY PROGRAM

Current Space (in square feet):
Library 3,065
Storage 751
TOTAL 3,816

Current Collection Size (# of volumes)
Math Stacks 27,767
Math Storage 16,342
TOTAL 44,109 volumes

Annual increase: 1,450 volumes (1996-97)

Program Needs (in square feet):
Collection Space 4,000 (15 volumes per square foot)
Staff 500
Service 300
Individual research space 900 (30 seats)
Group learning/ research space 400
Computer workstations 400 (10 seats)
TOTAL 6,500 square feet

5. A renovation of the existing **Natural Sciences Library** (NSL) space in the Allen Library will be required when NSL is relocated to the new Natural Sciences/ Natural Resources Library. Although it is not yet known for sure how this library space will be used, the need for increased electrical and telecommunications capacity seems likely. The Special Collections and Preservation Division is a unit which would benefit by increased visibility and collection space if it could expand to the Ground Floor of Allen

---

Back to Top / Return to Staffweb

University of Washington Libraries Administrative Offices
pwalker@u.washington.edu

University Libraries
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

User Surveys

Faculty and Student Surveys

The University of Washington Libraries has conducted extensive large-scale surveys of faculty and students since 1992. These triennial surveys focus on library use and satisfaction as well as user needs and library priorities.

Survey98 **Survey95**

Survey92

Non-affiliated User Surveys

Note: This section is under construction. Results and analysis will be added this summer.

UW Libraries has also conducted exit surveys of non-affiliated users on a triennial basis since 1993. These surveys provide an exit count by status (faculty, student, staff, and non-affiliated) an also ask non-affiliated users a series of questions on why they visited the library, what they did, their satisfaction, and in what capacity they visited the library (e.g. student at another institution, businessperson etc.)

UW Powerpoint Presentations for April 1999 ACRL Preconference, Assessing the Academic Networked Environment

- Asessment Implementation by Steve Hiller
- Making Sense of the Data by Steve Hiller
- Building a Culture of Assessment by Lizabeth Wilson
- Using Assessment Results in Planning by Lizabeth Wilson

Libraries Information Gateway | UW Home | Search

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University Libraries
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Survey 98

Survey98 - Information

Surveys were mailed in late April to 3750 UW faculty and a sample of 1000 graduate and professional students and 2000 undergraduates. A second mailing was sent in May to those identified as not returning surveys. The return rate for all groups was significantly higher than in 1995. Results from the University of Washington's triennial survey of faculty and students (earlier surveys were conducted in 1992 and 1995) confirmed that in an increasingly complex information environment, the UW Libraries remains central to the library and information needs of the campus community. Indeed, use of library services and resources increased over 1995 and satisfaction rates remained extraordinarily high.

Survey98 - Results

- Survey 98 Results and Analyses
- Faculty Survey Questions (in pdf format) and Faculty Results
- Graduate/Professional Student Survey Questions (in pdf format) and Graduate/Professional Results
- Undergraduate Survey Questions (in pdf format) and Undergraduate Results
- Biosciences Survey Questions (in pdf format) and Biosciences Results
- Fine Arts Survey Questions (in pdf format) and Fine Arts Results

Libraries Information Gateway | UW Home | Surveys Home

http://www.lib.washington.edu/surveys/survey98/

University Libraries
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

ADDITIONAL SURVEY FOR FINE ARTS FACULTY

Please complete the main survey before responding to these questions.

A. Please mark the category that best describes your primary responsibilities.

ART	__Studio Art	__Art history	__Design
DRAMA	__Drama and Theatre Production	__Theatre History, Theory & Criticism	
MUSIC	__Applied Music	__Music Classroom Teaching	

B. Please indicate the importance of the following library services to you.

	MORE IMPORTANT			LESS IMPORTANT	
Reference service	5	4	3	2	1
Library instruction	5	4	3	2	1
Access to electronic mail in the library	5	4	3	2	1
Interlibrary loan/article delivery	5	4	3	2	1
Access to digitized sound/images	5	4	3	2	1
Course reserves	5	4	3	2	1
Self serve photocopiers	5	4	3	2	1
Other, please specify:	5	4	3	2	1

C. What other resources/services could the library provide that would facilitate your work?

D. What do you like BEST about the Art, Drama, or Music libraries? (Answer for those libraries you use on a regular basis).

E. What do you like LEAST about the Art, Drama, or Music libraries?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

F. The UW Libraries has proposed construction of a new Fine Arts Library which would consolidate the existing Art, Drama, and Music libraries. While this facility is a number of years away, please help our planning efforts by prioritizing the importance of the spaces listed below.

	HIGHER PRIORITY			LOWER PRIORITY	
Collections space	5	4	3	2	1
Individual seating	5	4	3	2	1
Group seating	5	4	3	2	1
Group study room	5	4	3	2	1
Seminar/teaching room	5	4	3	2	1
Library instruction space	5	4	3	2	1
Exhibit display space	5	4	3	2	1
Performance space	5	4	3	2	1
Computer/Multimedia student lab	5	4	3	2	1
Copy Center	5	4	3	2	1
Teaching technology production lab/studio	5	4	3	2	1
Other, please specify:	5	4	3	2	1

Please write any additional comments on the back of the survey.

University Libraries
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Survey 98

SPRING 1998 FINE ARTS SURVEY RESULTS

Revised 3 Nov 1998
ALL RESPONSES IN PERCENT UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

1. Departmental Affiliation

Group	Art #	Art %	Drama #	Drama %	Music #	Music %
Faculty	17	42.5	7	17.5	16	40.0
Grad students	5	31.3	5	31.3	6	37.5
Undergrads	33	71.7	8	17.4	5	10.9

2. Current Library Services Importance

Service	Faculty			Grad Students			Undergrads		
	High%	Low%	Mean	High%	Low%	Mean	High%	Low%	Mean
Reference	90.0	2.5	4.58	93.8		4.50	70.2	17.0	3.85
Lib instruction	57.5	12.5	3.69	37.6	25.0	3.13	23.4	46.8	2.62
Email access	20.0	67.5	2.18	56.3	31.3	3.44	52.2	23.9	3.54
ILL	52.5	20.0	3.56	56.3	31.3	3.63	44.6	34.1	3.15
Digitized media	42.5	32.5	3.13	37.5	37.5	3.00	41.3	43.5	3.04
Course reserves	80.0	5.0	4.30	62.3	37.6	3.38	77.8	6.6	4.16
Self-serve copiers	30.0	52.5	2.61	87.5	12.6	4.06	80.8	2.1	4.36

3. Space Planning Priorities for Fine Arts Library

Space	Faculty			Grad Students			Undergrads		
	High%	Low%	Mean	High%	Low%	Mean	High%	Low%	Mean
Collections	97.5		4.95	100.0		4.88	73.4	6.6	4.20
Individual seating	70.0	10.0	3.87	81.3	6.3	4.38	80.4	4.4	4.24
Group seating	35.0	37.5	2.97	25.0	50.0	2.69	42.2	24.4	3.31
Group study room	32.5	37.5	2.97	37.6	43.8	2.69	42.2	26.6	3.36
Seminar/teach room	50.0	25.0	3.38	43.8	25.0	3.13	22.2	46.7	2.67
Lib instruction	35.0	22.5	3.16	31.3	50.0	2.88	22.2	40.0	2.69
Exhibit/display	40.0	45.0	2.85	18.8	68.8	2.44	50.0	28.2	3.30
Performance space	40.0	52.5	2.79	25.0	62.6	2.31	30.5	47.9	2.74
Computer/MM lab	67.5	10.0	3.97	62.5	12.5	3.88	84.5	11.1	4.36
Copy center	45.0	20.0	3.38	75.0	12.5	3.94	80.4		4.35
Teaching tech prod. lab/studio	50.0	27.5	3.32	18.8	50.0	2.53	47.8	22.7	3.55

Survey98 | Survey Home | UW Libraries Home

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SELECTED RESOURCES

Books and Journal Articles

Association of College and Research Libraries. "ACRL Guidelines for Branch Libraries in Colleges and Universities." *College & Research Libraries News* 52, no. 3 (March 1991): 171–174.

Byrne, Elizabeth D., Ralph H. Moon, and Gary R. Peete. "Criteria for Consolidation of Branch Libraries." *College & Research Libraries News* 55, no. 6 (June 1994): 348–350+.

Calderhead, Veronica. "Integrating a Branch Chemistry Library into the Main Campus Library: Two Perspectives—An Introductory Note" [and] "A User-Based Perspective of an Academic Chemistry Library Relocation: People First" [and] "An Operations Research Approach to a Chemistry Library Relocation: Measure Often, Move Once." *Science & Technology Libraries* 16, no. 1 (1996): 49–80.

Crawford, Walt. "Library Space: The Next Frontier?" *Online* 23, no. 2 (March 1999): 61–66.

Johnson, Margaret Ann. "Closing a Branch Library; or, What's Wrong With This Picture? A Cautionary Tale." *Technicalities* 16 (June 1996): 6–8.

Madison, Olivia M. A., Sally A. Fry, and David Gregory. "A Model for Reviewing Academic Branch Libraries Based on ACRL Guidelines and Standards." *College & Research Libraries* 55, no. 4 (July 1994): 342–354.

Seal, Robert A. "Academic Branch Libraries." In *Advances in Librarianship*, v. 14, edited by Wesley Simonton, 175–209. Orlando: Academic Press, 1986.

Searing, Susan E. "Meeting the Information Needs of Interdisciplinary Scholars: Issues for Administrators of Large University Libraries." *Library Trends* 45, no. 2 (Fall 1996): 315–342.

Shkolnik, Leon. "The Continuing Debate over Academic Branch Libraries." *College & Research Libraries News* 52, no. 4 (July 1991): 343–351.

Stemmer, John K., and John W. Tombarge. "Building a Virtual Branch." *College & Research Libraries News* 58, no. 4 (April 1997): 244–248.

Suozzi, Patricia A., and Sandra S. Kerbel. "The Organizational Misfits." *College & Research Libraries News* 53 (November 1992): 513–522.

Tenner, Elka, Suzanne D. Gyeszly, and Julia M. Rholes. "Electronic and Traditional Sources for a Newly Established Branch Library: Product Availability and User Preferences." *Collection Building* 17, no. 3 (1998): 123–128.

Walsh, Robert R. "Branch Library Planning in Universities." *Library Trends* 18, no. 2 (October 1969): 210–222.

SPEC KIT ORDER FORM

QTY	TITLE
	SP255 Branch Libs/Discrete Collectns
	SP254 Managing Printing Services
	SP253 Networked Info Services
	SP252 Supprt Staff Classifictn Studies
	SP251 Electronic Reference Service
	SP250 TL10: Educating Faculty
	SP249 Catalogng of Resrces Digitized
	SP248 Licensing of Electronic Prodcts
	SP247 Management of Lib Security
	SP246 Web Page Devel & Managmnt
	SP245 Electronic Reserves Operations
	SP244 TL 9: Renovatn & Reconfigurtn
	SP243 TL 8: Users with Disabilities
	SP242 Library Storage Facilities
	SP241 Gifts and Exchange Function
	SP240 Marketing and PR Activities
	SP239 Mentoring Programs in ARL
	SP238 ARL GIS Literacy Project
	SP237 Managing Food and Drink
	SP236 TL 7: E Theses/Diss
	SP235 Collaborative Coll Managmnt
	SP234 TL 6: Distance Learning
	SP233 ARL in Extension/Outreach
	SP232 Use of Teams in ARL
	SP231 Cust Service Programs in ARL
	SP230 Affirmative Action in ARL
	SP229 Evaluating Acad Libr Dirs
	SP228 TL 5: Preserving Digital Info
	SP227 Org of Doc Coll & Svcs
	SP226 TL 4: After the User Survey
	SP225 Partnerships Program
	SP224 Staff Training & Development
	SP223 TL 3: Electronic Scholarly Pubn
	SP222 Electronic Resource Sharing
	SP221 Evol & Status of Approval Plans
	SP220 Internet Training
	SP219 TL 2: Geographic Info Systems
	SP218 Info Technology Policies
	SP217 TL 1: Electronic Reserves
	SP216 Role of Libs in Distance Ed
	SP215 Reorg & Restructuring
	SP214 Digit Tech for Preservation
	SP213 Tech Svcs Workstations
	SP212 Non-Librarian Professionals
	SP211 Library Systems Office Org
	SP210 Strategic Planning
	SP209 Library Photocopy Operations
	SP208 Effective Library Signage
	SP207 Org of Collection Develop
	SP206 Faculty Organizations
	SP205 User Surveys in ARL Libs
	SP204 Uses of Doc Delivery Svcs
	SP203 Reference Svc Policies
	SP202 E-journals/Issues & Trends
	SP201 E-journals/Pol & Proced
	SP200 2001: A Space Reality
	SP199 Video Collect & Multimedia
	SP198 Automating Preserv Mgt
	SP197 Benefits/Professional Staff
	SP196 Quality Improve Programs
	SP195 Co-op Strategies in Foreign Acqs
	SP194 Librarian Job Descriptions
	SP193 Lib Develop & Fundraising
	SP192 Unpub Matls/Libs, Fair Use
	SP191 Prov Pub Svcs Remote User
	SP190 Chang Role of Book Repair
	SP189 Liaison Svcs in ARL Libs
	SP188 Intern, Residency & Fellow
	SP187 ILL Trends/Staff & Organ
	SP186 Virtual Library
	SP185 System Migration
	SP184 ILL Trends/Access
	SP183 Provision of Comp Print Cap
	SP182 Academic Status for Libns
	SP181 Perf Appr of Collect Dev Libn
	SP180 Flexible Work Arrangemts
	SP179 Access Services Org & Mgt
	SP178 Insuring Lib Colls & Bldgs
	SP177 Salary Setting Policies
	SP176 Svcs for Persons w/Disabilities
	SP175 Scholarly Info Centrs
	SP174 Expert Systems
	SP173 Staff Recognition Awards
	SP172 Information Desks
	SP171 Training of Tech Svc Staff
	SP170 Organization Charts
	SP169 Mgt of CD-ROM
	SP168 Student Employment
	SP167 Minority Recruitment
	SP166 Materials Budgets
	SP165 Cultural Diversity
	SP164 Remote Storage
	SP163 Affirmative Action
	SP162 Audiovisual Policies
	SP161 Travel Policies
	SP160 Preservation Org & Staff
	SP159 Admin of Lib Computer Files
	SP158 Strategic Plans
	SP157 Fee-based Services
	SP156 Automating Authority Control
	SP155 Visiting Scholars/Access
	SP154 Online Biblio Search
	SP153 Use of Mgt Statistics
	SP152 Brittle Books Program
	SP151 Qualitative Collect Analysis
	SP150 Bldg Security & Personal Safety
	SP149 Electronic Mail
	SP148 User Surveys
	SP147 Serials Control/Deselection
	SP146 Lib Dev Fund Raising Capabilit
	SP145 Lib Publications Programs
	SP144 Building Use Policies
	SP143 Search Proced Sr LibAdmin
	SP142 Remote Access Online Cats
	SP141 Approval Plans
	SP140 Performance Appraisal
	SP139 Performance Eval: Ref Svcs
	SP138 University Copyright
	SP137 Preservation Guidelines
	SP136 Managing Copy Cataloging
	SP135 Job Analysis
	SP134 Planning Mgt Statistics
	SP133 Opt Disks: Storage & Access
	SP132 Library-Scholar Communication
	SP131 Coll Dev Organization
	SP130 Retrospective Conversion
	SP129 Organization Charts
	SP128 Systems File Organization
	SP127 Interlibrary Loan
	SP126 Automated Lib Systems
	SP125 Tech Svcs Cost Studies
	SP124 Barcoding of Collections
	SP123 Microcomp Software Policies
	SP122 End-User Search Svcs
	SP121 Bibliographic Instruction
	SP120 Exhibits
	SP119 Catalog Maintenance Online
	SP118 Unionization
	SP117 Gifts & Exchange Function
	SP116 Organizing for Preservation
	SP115 Photocopy Services
	SP114 Binding Operations
	SP113 Preservation Education
	SP112 Reorg of Tech and Pub Svcs
	SP111 Cooperative Collection Dev
	SP110 Local Cataloging Policies
	SP109 Staff Training for Automation
	SP108 Strategic Planning
	SP107 University Archives
	SP106 Electronic Mail
	SP105 Nonbibliographic Dbases
	SP104 Microcomputers
	SP103 Asst/Assoc Dir Position
	SP102 Copyright Policies

QTY	TITLE	
____	SP101	User Studies
____	SP100	Collection Security
____	SP099	Branch Libraries
____	SP098	Telecommunications
____	SP097	Building Renovation
____	SP096	Online Catalogs
____	SP095	Lib Materials Cost Studies
____	SP094	Fund Raising
____	SP093	User Instructions for Online Cats
____	SP092	Interlibrary Loan
____	SP091	Student Assistants
____	SP090	Integrated Lib Info Systems
____	SP089	Tech Svcs Cost Studies
____	SP088	Corporate Use of Research Libs
____	SP087	Collect Descript/Assessment
____	SP086	Professional Development
____	SP085	Personnel Classification Sys
____	SP084	Public Svcs Goals & Objectvs
____	SP083	Approval Plans
____	SP082	Document Delivery Systems
____	SP081	Services to the Disabled
____	SP080	Specialty Positions
____	SP079	Internships/Job Exchanges
____	SP078	Recruitment-Selection
____	SP077	Use of Small Computers
____	SP076	Online Biblio Search Svcs
____	SP075	Staff Development
____	SP074	Fees for Services
____	SP073	External User Services
____	SP072	Executive Review
____	SP071	User Surveys: Eval of Lib Svcs
____	SP070	Preservation Procedures
____	SP069	Prep Emergencies/Disasters
____	SP068	AACR2 Implement Studies
____	SP067	Affirm Action Programs
____	SP066	Planning Preserv of Lib Materials
____	SP065	Retrospective Conversion
____	SP064	Indirect Cost Rates
____	SP063	Collective Bargaining
____	SP062	Online Biblio Search Svcs
____	SP061	Status of Librarians
____	SP060	Lib Materials Cost Studies
____	SP059	Microform Collections
____	SP058	Goals & Objectives
____	SP057	Special Collections
____	SP056	External Communication
____	SP055	Internl Com/Staff & Superv Role
____	SP054	Internal Com/Policies & Proced
____	SP053	Performance Appraisal
____	SP052	Cost Studies & Fiscal Plan
____	SP051	Professional Development
____	SP050	Fringe Benefits
____	SP049	Use of Annual Reports
____	SP048	External Fund Raising
____	SP047	Automated Cataloging
____	SP046	Plan Future of Card Catalog
____	SP045	Changing Role Personnel Officer
____	SP044	Automated Acquisitions
____	SP043	Automated Circulation Sys
____	SP042	Resource Sharing
____	SP041	Collection Assessment
____	SP040	Skills Training
____	SP039	Remote Storage
____	SP038	Collection Dev Policies
____	SP037	Theft Detection & Prevent
____	SP036	Allocation Materials Funds
____	SP035	Preservation of Lib Materials
____	SP034	Determin Indirect Cost Rate
____	SP033	Intergrat Nonprint Media
____	SP032	Prep, Present Lib Budget
____	SP031	Allocation of Resources
____	SP030	Support Staff, Student Assts
____	SP029	Systems Function
____	SP028	Gifts & Exchange Function
____	SP027	Physical Access
____	SP026	Bibliographic Access
____	SP025	User Statistics and Studies
____	SP024	User Surveys
____	SP023	Grievance Policies
____	SP022	Private Foundations
____	SP021	Paraprofessionals
____	SP020	Managerial Technical Specialists
____	SP019	Staff Allocations
____	SP018	Staff Development
____	SP017	Library Instruction
____	SP016	Reclassification
____	SP015	Goals & Objectives
____	SP014	Performance Review
____	SP013	Planning Systems
____	SP012	Acquisition Policies
____	SP011	Collection Development
____	SP010	Leave Policies
____	SP009	Tenure Policies
____	SP008	Collective Bargaining
____	SP007	Personnel Class Schemes
____	SP006	Friends of the Lib Organization
____	SP005	Performance Review
____	SP004	Affirmative Action
____	SP003	A Personnel Organization
____	SP003	Status of Librarians
____	SP002	Personnel Survey (flyer only)
____	SP001	Organization Charts

SPEC PRICE INFORMATION (ISSN 0160 3582)

☐ Subscription (6 issues per year; shipping included): $180 ARL members/$240 U.S. and Canada nonmembers/$340 international customers.

☐ Individual Kits: $30 ARL members/$40 nonmembers, plus shipping and handling.

☐ Individual issues of the Transforming Libraries (TL) subseries: $28, plus shipping and handling.

PAYMENT INFORMATION

Make check or money order payable in U.S. funds to the **ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES**, Federal ID #52-0784198-N.

Purchase Order # ______________________
Credit Card: ____ MasterCard ____ Visa Exp date ________
Account # ______________________
Account holder ______________________
Signature ______________________

SHIP TO
Name ______________________
Institution ______________________
Address (UPS will not deliver to P.O. boxes)
____
____
____
Phone ______________________
Fax ______________________
Email ______________________

SHIPPING & HANDLING

U.S. and Canada: UPS Ground delivery, $6 per publication.
International, bulk, and rush orders: Call or email for quote.

TOTAL SHIPPING $______ **TOTAL PRICE** $______

SEND ORDERS TO: ARL Publications Distribution Center, P.O. Box 531, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-0531
phone (301) 362-8196; fax (301) 206-9789; email <pubs@arl.org>

ORDER ONLINE AT: <http://www.arl.org/pubscat/index.html>